Class 283.1Q Book Ov2
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK

PRESENTED BY
Soc'y for Promoting Religion and Learning

THE NONJURORS

GRADUATE SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

18

GEN THEO SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

Jam. L.d B.p of Ch.r Ches.r
Thomas L.d B.p of Ex.r
Sam.l L.d B.p of Chichester
Richard L.d
WILLIAM L.d Arch B.p of CANTERBURY
his Grace
Jo.n L.d B.p of Bath & Wells
Thomas L.d B.p of Peterborough
Jonathan L.d B.p of Bristo

Engraven by R. White, and Sold at his house in Bloomsbury Market

Walker & Cockerell ph.sc.

"The Seven Bishops."

From an engraving in the Bodleian Library, Oxford.

THE NONJURORS

THEIR LIVES, PRINCIPLES, AND WRITINGS

BY

J. H. OVERTON, D.D.

RECTOR OF GUMLEY, AND CANON OF LINCOLN

LONDON
SMITH, ELDER, & CO., 15 WATERLOO PLACE
1902

[All rights reserved]

283.1 Q
Q 2
34337

GEN. THEO. SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

PREFACE

It has been my aim in this book to disentangle, as far as possible, the ecclesiastical from the political question; to trace the history of the Nonjurors, as a religious community, from the time of their temporary alienation from, to the time of their reabsorption in, the old Church of England, of which they contended that they had always been the most consistent and faithful members; to give the reader a clear and definite impression of the personalities of all the chief actors; and, finally, to bring into prominence the later phase of the movement, which appears to be little known, though it certainly has a distinct interest of its own.

The nature of the work, which I have perhaps too presumptuously undertaken, has rendered it necessary for me to write many letters and to consult many manuscripts—in other words, to give, I fear, much trouble to many people; and it is my pleasing duty to express here my grateful acknowledgment of the uniform courtesy of all who have assisted me. They are (in alphabetical order) the Hon. Mrs. Bulkeley-Owen; the Rev. R. E. G. Cole, rector of Doddington; the Rev. Canon Cooper, vicar of Cuckfield; the Right Rev. J. Dowden, Bishop of Edinburgh; the Rev. J. L. Fish,

rector of St. Margaret Pattens; the Rev. J. R. Hakewill, rector of Braybrooke; H. Jenner, Esq., British Museum; the Rev. W. D. Macray, Litt.D., Bodleian Library; Professor J. E. B. Mayor and J. Bass Mullinger, Esq., St. John's College, Cambridge; W. Phillips, Esq., Shrewsbury; the Rev. F. W. Ragg, vicar of Marsworth; the Rev. F. Sanders, vicar of Hoylake; the Rev. R. M. Serjeantson, St. Sepulchre's, Northampton; the Rev. R. W. Taylor, rector of Wouldham; and the Rev. W. R. Watson, rector of Saltfleetby St. Peter's.

Printed matter may be regarded as *publici juris*; but there is one printed work to which I feel bound to refer. Mr. Lathbury's 'History of the Nonjurors' has stood alone for many years as the one book which dealt exclusively with the subject, and I desire to acknowledge my great indebtedness to it; but more than half a century has elapsed since its publication, and there seems to be need of another work, not to supersede, but to supplement it.

November 1902.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	A GENERAL INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE DEPRIVED FATHERS	23
III.	BISHOPS OF THE NEW CONSECRATION	84
IV.	THE NONJURING CLERGY	153
V.	THE NONJURING LAITY	228
VI.	NONJURING MODES OF WORSHIP	280
VII.	THE LATER NONJURORS	309
VIII.	THE TWO IRREGULAR SUCCESSIONS	346
IX.	THE NONJURORS AND GENERAL LITERATURE	377
X.	THE NONJURORS IN SCOTLAND	418
XI.	THE NONJURORS AND THE EASTERN CHURCH	451
	AN ALPHABETICAL LIST OF NONJURORS, CLERICAL AND LAY	467
	INDEX	497
	PORTRAIT GROUP OF THE SEVEN BISHOPS	*Frontispiece*

THE NONJURORS

CHAPTER I

A GENERAL INTRODUCTION

"Perhaps the time has come when we may venture, without offence or loss of intellectual caste, to challenge the vulgar verdict upon the Nonjurors, and may at least call on their censors to name any English sect so eminent, in proportion to its numbers, alike for solid learning and for public as well as private virtues. Faction has too long been allowed to visit the violence of a few hotspurs on the entire class of loyal subjects, not merely by ruining them while living, but also by blackening their memory to this hour. The caricatures of hireling libellers pass current with most as the final judgment of posterity; phantoms which will never be laid till brought face to face with the authentic forms which they personate and defame." [1]

More than thirty years have elapsed since these words were written by one of the most finished scholars of the day; and everything that has appeared during the interval has tended to confirm the high estimate which he then formed of this interesting body of men. Many will disagree with their ecclesiastical, still more, perhaps, with their political views; but as to their learning and their virtues, the two points on which Professor Mayor lays stress, the more that facts come to light, the more convinced will an impartial critic be that they are not unduly praised by him.

[1] *Life of Ambrose Bonwicke*, by his Father; edited by J. E. B. Mayor. 1870. To the Reader (by the Editor).

Now, learning and virtue are not so common that we can afford to let signal instances of both in a whole body of men slip into oblivion without a distinct loss; so that, even if the history of the Nonjurors were merely the history of a bygone phase of thought and action which is now obsolete, it would still be worth writing. But, on the contrary, the turn of the wheel during the last quarter of a century has brought the position of the Nonjurors (as Churchmen, not as politicians) into much greater prominence, and caused it to have a direct bearing upon the present state of the Church. It is hoped, therefore, that no apology is needed for drawing attention to their history.

To begin at the beginning:

By the term Nonjurors is meant, in the first instance, those Churchmen whose consciences would not allow them to take the oaths of allegiance to William and Mary after the Revolution of 1688, because they had previously taken similar oaths to James II., and who sacrificed their incomes and future prospects in consequence. The death of James II. in 1701 did not release them from their obligation; for they had sworn to be faithful, not only to the King himself, but to 'his heirs and lawful successors.' Indeed, their difficulty was greatly intensified, because an Act of Parliament was quickly passed requiring them 'to abjure the pretended Prince of Wales,' whom they honestly believed to be the 'lawful heir' of James II., and to acknowledge William III. and each of his successors, according to the Act of Settlement, as 'rightful and lawful King'; and in this form the oath was made a necessary qualification for every employment either in Church or State.[1]

[1] Previously the oath of allegiance to William and Mary had expressly omitted the words 'rightful and lawful' which occurred in former oaths, in order that it might embrace those who were willing to acknowledge the new sovereigns as sovereigns *de facto*, though not *de jure*.

On the accession of George I. in 1714 another Act was passed requiring everyone who held any public post of more value than 5*l.* a year to declare his belief on oath that 'George was rightful and lawful king, and that the person pretending to be Prince of Wales had not any right or title whatsoever.' Those who refused to take the oaths of 1701–2 and 1714 were sometimes called 'Non-Abjurors' to distinguish them from the Nonjurors who refused the original oaths of 1689; but substantially they all belonged to the same party and acted on the same principle, so there is no need to dwell on the distinction at present.

As the practical outcome of their conduct was that they were deprived of their posts, whether lay or clerical, on account of their refusal to take the necessary oaths, the term 'Nonjuror' is a correct enough designation of them so far as it goes. At the same time, it gives a very inadequate notion of their principles, which extended much farther than to a conscientious objection to take fresh oaths in contradiction to those they had previously taken. Quite apart from the oaths, the Nonjurors—and, it must be confessed, many also who were not Nonjurors—were quite precluded by principles they had long professed from accepting either King William, or Queen Mary, or Queen Anne, or, above all, King George as their sovereign.

To appreciate the truth of this assertion, we must go back to an earlier period. Rightly or wrongly (and I am by no means prepared to say 'rightly'), the doctrine of passive obedience or non-resistance (the two expressions mean practically the same thing) to those monarchs who had the divine, hereditary, indefeasible right had long been considered not only as *a* doctrine, but as *the* peculiar doctrine of the Church of England—that is, the doctrine which distinguished English Churchmen from 'papists'

on the one hand who set the Pope, and 'plebists' on the other who set the people, above the Lord's anointed.[1] Those who held this doctrine appealed to Holy Scripture, both the Old Testament and the New. They applied the principles of the patriarchal government and of the Mosaic law to the existing state of affairs in England. They contended that kings were fathers of their people, and ought to be implicitly obeyed as such. They appealed to the government of the chosen people which was sanctioned by the Almighty; to the precepts and practice of our Blessed Lord and of His Apostles; to the Church in its earliest and purest ages; to the formularies of their own Church, especially to the Homilies, the Articles, and the Canons. 'The Institution of a Christian Man' taught the same doctrine, and the post-Reformation period furnished many confirmations of it. The great casuist, Robert Sanderson, taught it in very strong terms;[2] several Acts of Parliament, passed between the Restoration and the Revolution, condemn all resistance, and in such terms as to exclude any exceptions; Sir Robert Filmer's theories of government met with wide acceptance; the University of Oxford stamped with its authority the doctrine of non-resistance by three distinct and formal decrees of its Convocation, in 1622, 1647, and 1683 respectively, the last pronouncing resistance 'a damnable doctrine.'

Strange to say, none had committed themselves more distinctly to the doctrine of non-resistance than those

[1] See Preface to Filmer's 'Mixed Monarchy,' in *The Political Discourses of Sir R. Filmer*, published in 1680, twenty-seven years after the writer's death.

[2] For the sentiments of Dr. Sanderson and the others referred to, see *Compleat History of the Affair of Dr. Sacheverell*, p. 140, where all are given at a glance, with chapter and verse for each. Also, *The History of Passive Obedience since the Reformation* (1689), where quotations from a vast number of authors of all schools in the Church in favour of the doctrine are given *verbatim*.

who afterwards became the staunchest supporters, on the ecclesiastical side, of the Revolution. Tillotson and Burnet[1] had impressed it upon poor Lord William Russell, when he was under sentence of death, as if it were an article of faith, without the explicit acceptance of which there could hardly be any hope of salvation. Tenison did the same when ministering to the unfortunate Duke of Monmouth before his execution. Stillingfleet defended it with his usual force and ability; so did Patrick; so did Beveridge; so did White Kennett; and all these accepted bishoprics under the Revolution settlement which to the ordinary mind seems absolutely irreconcilable with it. William Sherlock, afterwards Master of the Temple and Dean of St. Paul's, wrote in 1684 one of the ablest defences of it in its extremest form—'The Case of Resistance'—and six years later an equally able treatise in opposition to it—'The Case of Allegiance.'

It was the same with clergy of a lower rank. What the Nonjuring Dean Granville says of the Durham clergy is applicable, more or less, to the clergy generally.[2] It was a bitter and unfortunately too well-grounded an attack upon the Established Church when Pope made his Goddess of Dulness say in the person of that Church:

> Ah! if my sons may learn an earthly thing,
> Teach them that one, sufficient for a king;
> That which my priests, and mine alone, maintain:
> Which, as it dies or lives, we fall or reign;
> May you, my Cam and Isis, preach it long!
> The Right Divine of kings to govern wrong.
>
> 'Dunciad,' Book IV.

[1] Since the above was written, a most important and interesting volume, entitled *Supplement to Burnet's History of My Own Time*, edited by H. Foxcroft (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902), has appeared. Appendix I., 'Additional Note on Burnet's Change of View with regard to Passive Obedience,' pp. 515–19, gives an exhaustive account of Burnet's attitude.

[2] See *The Remains of Denis Granville, Dean of Durham*, especially his

It should be added that by the terms 'non-resistance' and 'passive obedience' was not meant, at least by the Nonjurors, a blind, unreasoning acquiescence in everything which a headstrong and cruel tyrant might enjoin. The epithet 'passive' does not intensify, but mitigates, the force of the word obedience, and the term 'resistance' is taken in its literal sense of opposing by actual—one might almost say physical—force.[1]

But it certainly required some ingenuity to reconcile what was then generally regarded as 'Church Doctrine' with the acknowledgment of one who came with a large armed force to 'deliver' the nation; and a great number of those who managed to swallow the new oaths did so with more or less wry faces. But about four hundred beneficed clergy, a few unbeneficed, and a sprinkling of the laity, could not manage it, and it is with these that we have now to do.

It should be noted that their enthusiastic loyalty to their lawful sovereign, as God's vicegerent, was balanced by another sentiment, which was at least as influential. They realised far more vividly than most of their contemporaries the existence of the Church as a distinct spiritual society with laws of its own, whose connection with the State, however beneficial, was purely accidental; and, as a consequence, they insisted on the independency of the Church of any power on earth in the exercise of her purely spiritual power and authority. This conviction pervaded all their conduct, and still pervades all their writings; and there was perhaps no greater service rendered by them than the witness they bore to this

Letters 'to the Vice-Dean and Prebendaries' and 'to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Durham,' i. 111–16.

[1] For an excellent and lucid explanation of what was meant, see *A Compleat Collection of the Works of John Kettlewell*, ii. 143, in the treatise, *Christianity a Doctrine of the Cross.*

truth in an age which was sadly in danger of lapsing into the grossest Erastianism. It also prevented them from ever allowing their earthly sovereign, sacred being as they almost regarded him, to encroach upon what was not his province. In other words, their determination to render unto Cæsar the things that were Cæsar's, even if they had to sacrifice every earthly advantage to do so, was balanced by a still stronger determination to 'render unto God the things that were God's.'[1]

It was really the application of this principle, far more than their refusal of the oaths, which brought the Nonjurors into direct collision with the rulers of Church and State, and led unhappily to the setting up of two communions, each claiming to be the true Church of England. The ejection of bishops, simply by an Act of Parliament, without any synodical action, without anything that bore the faintest resemblance to an ecclesiastical judgment; and the putting into their sees—that is, into sees not canonically vacant—new bishops by the civil power, was about as glaring a violation of this principle as can well be conceived; and it is hard to see how those who held the principle could help feeling, not only justified, but in duty bound to continue to exercise the functions which the Church had given them, and which the Church had not taken away from them.

Hence arose the schism, which the Nonjurors maintained was no fault of theirs. They maintained that *they* were in exactly the same position in which they had ever been. *They* had not made the slightest alteration in

[1] On this point, see *inter alia*, *The Case of the Regale and the Pontificate*, in Leslie's Theological Works, iii. 291; *Elements of Policy, Civil and Ecclesiastical, in a Mathematical Method*, by M. E. (that is, Matthias Earbery); Jeremy Collier's *Answer to Sherlock's Case of Allegiance, passim*; John Lindsay's *Grand and Important Question about the Church Parochial Communion*, &c. &c.; Hickes's *Constitution of the Catholick Church*, p. 84 and *passim*.

doctrine, in discipline, or in worship. It was absurd to say that those had made the separation who remained exactly where they were before, 'unless' (to use the racy simile of a Nonjuring leader) 'you will affirm that when a ship breaks from the shoar when she lies at anchor, the shoar removes from her, and not she from the shoar.'[1] The schism began, not when the Nonjurors refused the oaths, not even when the bishops were deprived by secular authority; but when new bishops were appointed to sees not vacant. Then altar was set up against altar, and surely those who set up the rival altars were really responsible for the separation.[2]

It will be understood that this is putting the matter from the Nonjurors' point of view; and, so far, they were quite agreed in their principles. But they differed from the very first as to how these principles were to be carried out in practice; whether, for example, they were justified in attending the public churches, in the greater part of the worship in which they could heartily join; or whether they should abstain from attendance on account of what were called 'the immoral prayers.' But these were not really vital points. It was not until the death of the last but one of the deprived bishops who claimed their allegiance that the first rift in the lute was perceived. The sole survivor was willing to waive his claim, heartily desiring that the schism should be closed, and his now like-minded successor be accepted. Then a really essential difference arose between those who had hitherto been in substantial agreement. And this difference was, alas! only a prelude to many further

[1] Dr. Hickes's *Apology for the New Separation*, in a Letter to Dr. J. Sharp, Archbishop of York.

[2] See this point clearly brought out in Leslie's *Regale and Pontificate*, Theological Works, iii. 334–5.

differences, which divided and subdivided the little community until the vanishing point was reached.

A General Introduction is not the place to discuss these differences in detail; they will come only too prominently before us in later chapters. But they suggest one answer to a question which ought to be fairly met at the outset. If, it may be asked, the Nonjurors as a body were, as Professor Mayor describes them, men of solid learning and private virtues, who might challenge comparison with any body of equal numbers, how is it that they made so little way, and that, having struggled on for about a century, they entirely died out? To put it more correctly, they were re-absorbed into the great body of English Churchmen, from whom they had never desired to be separated. But that is a distinction which need not here be insisted upon.

But if there were no other answer to the question, this would really be a sufficient one. They could not agree among themselves; and men in their position who cannot present a united front have no more chance of success than a small army opposed to a large army if *it* cannot present a united front. Their principles absolutely forbade them to make an arrangement by which one party might form a body of its own, say, under the leadership of Dodwell, and another under that of Hickes; and then the latter split up again, one section under the leadership, say, of Collier, and another under that of Spinckes, and so on *ad infinitum*, each meanwhile agreeing to differ from the other and recognising it as a distinct Church. For they all held that there could be but one Church in England, and if they were not that Church what were they?

Another obvious answer is that the Nonjurors were politically embarked in a hopeless cause; they identified themselves with the Stuarts, and the Stuarts dragged

them down with them in their fall. At the same time we must remember that it is easy enough to be wise after the event; but if by an effort of the historical imagination we throw ourselves into the situation as it appeared to contemporaries, we shall find that the cause by no means appeared hopeless. In spite of the just alarm which the infatuated policy of James II. had raised, and the need which was generally felt of 'a deliverer,' the Revolution, or at any rate the course taken after the Revolution, was not really popular. If the Stuarts and their partisans had shown ordinary prudence, the restoration of the old line might very probably have taken place. William III.'s position in England had never been secure, and it became still less so after the death of Queen Mary and after the explosion of the warming-pan story—though that story was still believed in many quarters, and professed to be believed in more, long after reasonable men must have been convinced of its falsehood. The death of the young Duke of Gloucester in 1700, which in itself revived the hopes of the Jacobites by removing a formidable future claimant, led immediately to the Act of Settlement, which gave the reversion of the Crown to the aged Electress Sophia and her heirs. This was at best accepted as a necessity, raising no enthusiasm in any quarter, and least of all in that family in whose favour it was passed; while it gave the Jacobites a handle which they were not slow to turn. A race of foreigners was to be introduced to rule England; the hereditary principle was to be violated in the most glaring way; and, what was to many worst of all, the throne was to be given to one who was no direct descendant of the Royal Martyr. Then followed in 1701–2 the Abjuration Oath, which forced many to declare themselves who would otherwise have remained neutral, or at least quiet.

The accession of Queen Anne in 1702 made the Nonjurors still more hopeful. The new Queen's church principles would surely lead her to sympathise with them; natural affection would make her lean towards her brother; and she was known to dislike extremely the thought of being succeeded by her distant German cousins. She seems to have been regarded by many as a sort of Regent for her brother, who was still only a boy of thirteen—too young to occupy so precarious a throne. At any rate, it is clear that, by some peculiar process of reasoning, many who had regarded the elder sister as a usurper accepted the younger as a representative of the divine, hereditary right.[1] On this ground the 'History of the Rebellion,' by her grandfather, Lord Clarendon, now published for the first time, was dedicated to her; the ceremony of the Royal Touch was revived; and all through her reign, but especially during the last four years of it, there was an expectation of the return of the Stuarts.

Nor did the peaceable accession of George I. altogether destroy this expectation; no, nor yet the suppression of the rebellion of 1715. At any rate, if constant and varied demonstrations of popular feeling could be trusted, the Nonjurors were fully justified in hoping that the political cause which they espoused might again come uppermost.

But these appearances were fallacious; from the collapse of James in 1688 to the collapse of his grandson in 1745 the legitimate line could never have been permanently established unless its representatives had abandoned their religion, which they would never do.

[1] See Leslie's *Wolf stript of the Shepherd's clothing*, which is dedicated to 'the Queen and the Three Estates of Parliament'; William Law's Sermon on the Peace of Utrecht (*Life*, by Overton, pp. 10–12); *Life of Fenton*, in Johnson's *Lives of the Poets*, ii. 228, and innumerable contemporary notices.

Englishmen might claim their traditional right of grumbling, and that grumbling might sometimes show itself in really serious riots; but it never meant that they were ready to accept another Roman Catholic sovereign. A rooted conviction that Rome meant arbitrary power, or a government framed after the model of France, overpowered all other feelings; and this conviction grew in strength as the years rolled on. The body of the nation observed with alarm, not with satisfaction, the unpopularity of the Hanoverian dynasty. The dread of 'the Pretender' became quite a bugbear; men feared that he *might* succeed instead of hoping that he *would* succeed; and as his chances of success grew fainter and fainter, the cause of the Nonjurors grew weaker and weaker, until at last they quietly faded away altogether. And yet there were no more uncompromising opponents of Romanism than the Nonjurors, as a rule, were. It was pure ignorance that led men to confound their efforts to restore primitive doctrine and practice with a desire to restore the system of Rome.

Before concluding this general survey it is necessary to face fairly a question which is suggested by the assertions of men whose names carry weight. Did the Nonjurors degenerate into men of loose morals, injurious to the interests of society? This is what Dr. Johnson roundly asserts, and Lord Macaulay, *more suo*, amplifies in vivid detail. The passage in Boswell's 'Life of Johnson' is as follows:—

> He told us the play was to be 'The Hypocrite,' altered from Cibber's 'Nonjuror,' so as to satirise the Methodists. 'I do not think,' said he, 'the character of the Hypocrite justly applicable to the Methodists, but it was very applicable to the Nonjurors. I once said to Dr. Madan, a clergyman of Ireland, who was a great Whig, that perhaps a Nonjuror would have been less criminal in taking the oaths imposed by the ruling power than

refusing them; because refusing them necessarily laid him under an almost irresistible temptation to be more criminal; for a man *must* live, and, if he precludes himself from the support furnished by the Establishment, will probably be reduced to very wicked shifts to maintain himself.

Then follows an illustration which one cannot quote in these more delicate days.[1] Johnson repeats the accusation in his Life of Fenton, the nonjuring poet.[2]

The passage in Macaulay runs thus:

To a person whose virtue is not high-toned this way of life [that of a Nonjuror in the house of a patron] is full of peril. If he is of a quiet disposition, he is in danger of sinking into a servile, sensual, drowsy parasite. If he is of an active and aspiring nature, it may be feared that he will become expert in those bad arts by which, more easily than by faithful service, retainers make themselves agreeable or formidable. To discover the weak side of every character, to flatter every passion and prejudice, to sow discord and jealousy where love and confidence ought to exist, to watch the moment of indiscreet openness for the purpose of extracting secrets important to the prosperity and honour of families, such are the practices by which keen and restless spirits have too often avenged themselves for the humiliation of dependence. The public voice loudly accused many Nonjurors of requiting the hospitality of their benefactors with villainy as black as that of the hypocrite depicted in the masterpiece of Molière. Indeed, when Cibber undertook to adapt that noble comedy to the English stage, he made his Tartuffe a Nonjuror; and Johnson, who cannot be supposed to have been prejudiced against the Nonjurors, frankly owned that Cibber had done them no wrong.[3]

He then refers in a note to the passage in 'The Life of Fenton,' to a pamphlet called 'The Character of a Jacobite,' 1690, and to a passage in Kettlewell's Life prefixed to his 'Compleat Works.'

[1] See Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, chap. x, under the year 1775. In the Illustrated Edition in 4 vols., ii. 208–9.

[2] See Johnson's *Lives of the Poets*, ii. 227.

[3] *History of England*, chap. xiv.; in the edition in 2 vols. of 1873, ii. 110.

The evidence is rather scanty. Dr. Johnson gives practically none at all, but merely his own *ipse dixit*; and he must have had his information from hearsay, for at the time when he entered public life the Nonjurors had dwindled into a very small party, and he was not, so far as I am aware, brought into personal contact with any of them[1] or any of their patrons. Lord Macaulay's reference to 'The Character of a Jacobite' is hardly to the point, for more reasons than one. (1) The pamphlet is a very prejudiced, *ex parte* statement, which must be received with the utmost caution. (2) The date of it is 1690, when it was too early to predicate anything of the Nonjurors as a body, for they were not yet a settled community. (3) A 'Jacobite' and a 'Nonjuror' were not convertible terms; there were Jacobites, and most active and aggressive Jacobites too, who were not Nonjurors; and there were Nonjurors who were in no active sense of the term Jacobites, men who were content to live peaceably and quietly without a thought of disturbing the existing government.

The evidence of Kettlewell is far the most important. It is as follows:

> The clergy here who have no business, but stay in town as the best place of gifts, may be sent into the counties, where they will be much better maintained at half the charge, and where they may do service. And others will have no excuse to spend most of their time in coffee-houses and hunting after gifts; but when they are not employed in their holy functions may follow their studies to improve themselves.

Thus far Mr. Kettlewell himself, in his 'Model of a Fund of Charity for Needy and Suffering Clergy,'[2] which

[1] Unless we except Bishop Archibald Campbell, who was after all a Scotch, not an English Nonjuror, though he was more in England than in Scotland.

[2] *Compleat Works of John Kettlewell, with Life*, i. Appendix XIX.

was put forth in January 1694–5. His contemporary biographer, who may be regarded as equally trustworthy with himself, writes that, before the fund was started,

> Not a few were imposed upon in their charity, and several undeserving persons (who are always the most confident), by their going up and down did much prejudice to the truly deserving, whose modesty would not suffer them to solicit for themselves. Yea, there were also some *false pretenders*, persons of bad characters, and such as were not deprived on account of the oaths, but for other reasons, and whose only merit consisted in being secret spies and informers for the ministry; one of whom I knew who had forged Letters of Orders to qualify himself; those by appearing more zealous than others made it their business to insinuate themselves, and do all the mischief in their power to those whom they pretended to side with. [This Kettlewell saw.] He was also very sensible that some of his brethren spent too much of their time in places of concourse and news, by depending for their subsistence upon those whom they there got acquainted with [1]—and so forth.

This evidence may be taken as absolutely unimpeachable; but what does it amount to? That there were unworthy members of the party, and impostors who traded on the sympathy shown towards the pious and blameless sufferers for conscience' sake. Human nature must have been strangely different from what it is now if there had not been. But it must be remembered that this was in the early years of the separation; and it is probable that the black sheep were soon expelled from the flock, and no others admitted into it; for, as will appear presently, nothing was more common than for a deprived Nonjuror to find refuge in the house of a sympathising patron; and I have not found one single instance of the patron's confidence being abused, but many instances of his kindness being repaid by services rendered. Dr. Johnson's is a great name, but it is only the name of one man after all.

[1] *Compleat Works of John Kettlewell, with Life*, i. 163.

And when one finds scanty and vague statements on one side, and a perfect avalanche of testimony on the other, one naturally feels that the latter outweighs the former. Part of this testimony will be found in the following chapters which deal with individual Nonjurors; and those who have the patience to wade through these chapters may be appealed to in the language in which Jehu appealed to 'the servants of his lord,' 'Ye know the men and their communication.' Of outside testimonies there are most varied kinds: some from their friends, of course; some from men who totally disagreed with them; some from contemporaries; some from men in later times who have really studied their history. To take a few out of very many. Bishop Burnet was, perhaps, of all their contemporaries, the man who was most alien from their spirit. He was regarded by them as their arch-enemy, and he certainly stood quite at the opposite pole both in politics and theology. And yet he could write to one of them when the relations were most strained (January 29, 1714–15):

> I never think the worse of men for their different sentiments in such matters; I am sure I am bound to think much the better of them for adhering firmly to the dictates of their conscience, when it is so much to their loss, and when so sacred a thing as an oath is in the case. But I have so great a regard both to yourself and your friends, that as I am extremely sorry that the Church hath so long lost the service of so worthy men, so am I very glad to have it in my power, from what you write to me, to vindicate you and them in that particular.[1]

Another contemporary, Archbishop Sharp, 'had a very great tenderness and pity for all those who could

[1] Letter from Bishop Burnet to Thomas Baker just before the ejectment of the latter from his Fellowship at Cambridge, quoted in *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of T. Baker, of St. John's College, Cambridge, from the papers of Dr. Z. Grey*, by Robert Masters, pp. 32–33.

not satisfy their consciences on this point.' 'As for those, whether clergy or laity, who were dissatisfied upon pure principles of conscience, and behaved themselves modestly and peaceably, keeping their sentiments to themselves and giving no disturbance to the public, he had as hearty a tenderness and compassion for all such as was possible.'[1] Thomas Sherlock, the able son of an able father, might be supposed to inherit a prejudice against the Nonjurors, for no man had been so vituperated by them as William Sherlock, the father, whom they regarded as a renegade to their cause. But Thomas Sherlock was a singularly clear-headed and fair-minded man, and he recognised their merits. In 1716 (a critical time) he was not afraid to say a word in favour of the Nonjurors in a sermon preached on the Thanksgiving Day for the suppression of the Rebellion:

> The principles on which the legality of the present Establishment is maintained are, I think, but improperly made a part of the present quarrel which divides the nation. There are but few who have not precluded themselves on this point, those, I mean, who have had courage and plainness enough to own their sense and forego the advantages either of birth or education, rather than give a false security to the Government which under their present persuasion they could not make good. To these I have nothing more to say than to wish them, what I think they well deserve, a better cause.[2]

Hilkiah Bedford, a leading Nonjuror and afterwards bishop, could boldly claim for his party what he could not without manifest absurdity have claimed if they had been what Dr. Johnson said they were. 'At worst,' he writes, 'they are but unhappy mistaken men, who other-

[1] *Life of John Sharp, Archbishop of York*, by his Son, Thomas Sharp, Archdeacon of Northumberland; edited by Thomas Newcome, pp. 264-5.

[2] Quoted by Dr. Doran in *London in the Jacobite Times*, i. 239.

wise are as eminent for good sense, piety, and learning as any other denomination of men among all the contending parties in these divided times.'[1]

Among the many testimonies from those who might naturally be expected to be favourable to the Nonjurors I select one written in 1825, because it has a certain historical value as showing that the principles for which these men contended were not altogether in abeyance in the English Church until they were revived by the Oxford Movement. The writer is John Bowdler, who was of a Nonjuring stock; but he speaks, it will be observed, not only for himself, but for others who lived in his day.

> The names of the principal Nonjurors were too eminent to be easily lost, and the opinions which they asserted are so interwoven with the principles of our Church that they deserve not only to be remembered, but to be carefully studied. . . . They were men of unquestionable learning and unimpeachable integrity, of exalted piety and sound loyalty, and distinguished for all the charities of life; discriminating carefully between that authority which, under the form of an established church, the government of a country can bestow, and that which they had received according to the appointments of God. . . . Whatever may be thought of their conduct in particular instances, their principles will be had in honour by all sound members of the Church of England; and at this time, when the controversies which then took place are regarded with considerable interest, their names and opinions have, perhaps, acquired increased respect.[2]

Another testimony has a special value of its own, because it comes from one who had made a special study

[1] *A Seasonable and Modest Apology in behalf of the Rev. Dr. G. Hickes and other Nonjurors, in a Letter to T. Wise, D.D., on the occasion of his Visitation at Canterbury*, 1710. Anonymous, but known to have been written by H. Bedford.

[2] *Memoir of John Bowdler, with some account of Thomas Bowdler* [by John Bowdler, the younger, 1825], pp. 82–3

of the life and writings of a man who was in some respects the most eminent of all the Nonjurors, Jeremy Collier, a study which he could not have made without learning thoroughly what the mind and life of the Nonjurors were; for Collier did not, like Law for instance, stand aloof, but threw himself thoroughly into all the doings of his co-religionists. 'The just reputation,' wrote Mr. Barham in 1840, 'of the Nonjurors, too long overcast by their enemies, is now recovering its true sphere of elevation.'[1]

A word may be added about the incident which led to Dr. Johnson's famous charge, which has so much damaged the reputation of the Nonjurors. After the Rebellion of 1715, Colley Cibber, who had achieved a reputation both as a playwright and as an actor, improved the occasion by bringing out (November 1717) a play called 'The Nonjuror,' the history of which had better be given in his own words:

> At this time Jacobitism had lately exerted itself by the most unprovoked Rebellion that our histories have handed down to us since the Norman Conquest; I therefore thought that to set the Authors and Principles of that desperate Folly in a fair Light by allowing the mistaken consciences of some their best excuse, and by making the artful Pretenders of Conscience as ridiculous as they were ungratefully wicked, was a subject fit for the honest Satire of Comedy, and what might, if it succeeded, do Honour to the Stage, by showing the valuable use of it. And considering what numbers, at that time, might come to it, as prejudiced Spectators, it may be allowed that the Speculation was not less hazardous than laudable. To give Life, therefore, to this design, I borrowed the *Tartuffe* of *Molière* and turned him into a modern *Nonjuror:* Upon the Hypocrisy of the *French* character I ingrafted a stronger Wickedness, that of an *English* Popish Priest, lurking under the doctrine of our Church,

[1] 'Life of Jeremy Collier,' prefixed to his *Ecclesiastical History*, in 9 vols., by Francis Barham, p. xcix.

to raise his Fortune upon the Ruin of a worthy gentleman, whom his dissembled Sanctity had seduced into the treasonable cause of a Roman Catholic.[1]

'Laudable' as the design may have been, the personal insinuations, for which there was not the shadow of a foundation, were hardly laudable. The hero was a Dr. Wolf, a Nonjuror who had been admitted into the family of a Sir John Woodvile, an elderly baronet, who had married, as his second wife, a lady much younger than himself. This wife the Nonjuror attempted to seduce, under the pretence of making love to her step-daughter. The following passage occurs in it:

Sir John. Well, sir, what say our last advices from Avignon?

Dr. Wolf. All goes right. The Council has approv'd our scheme and press mightily despatch among our friends in England.

Sir John. But, pray, Doctor!

Doctor. Hold, sir; now we are alone, give me leave to inform you better. Not that I am vain of any worldly title, but since it has pleased our Court to dignify me, our Church's right obliges me to take it.

Sir John. Pray, sir, explain.

Doctor. Our last express has brought me this, which (far unworthy as I am) promotes me to the vacant see of Thetford.

Sir John. Is it possible! My Lord, I joy in your advancement.

Now the see of Thetford had lately 'become vacant' (though that is an absurdly inaccurate way of putting it) by the death of Dr. Hickes; and Hickes' successor, who may be regarded as either Henry Gandy or Thomas Brett—they were both consecrated on the same day—had been appointed a few months before. There is not

[1] *An Apology for the Life of Mr. Colley Cibber, Comedian and Patentee of the Theatre-Royal. With an historical View of the Stage in his own Time.* Written by Himself. Second Edition, 1740, p. 427.

the faintest shadow of a suspicion that any of the three —whose lives will be noticed in a future chapter—in any way corresponded with Dr. Wolf, who was a hypocrite, a Jesuit in disguise, a betrayer of female virtue and of his generous benefactor—in short, a most dangerous man to admit into any decent household. All the Nonjuring bishops, whose lives will be more or less fully described in these pages, were men of totally different characters from Dr. Wolf. Is it possible, with this knowledge before us, to trust the accuracy of the play generally?

I do not think Colley Cibber consciously misrepresented the Nonjurors. He probably knew very little about them; for he intimates that Dr. Wolf's predecessor in the see of Thetford was Lawrence Howell, who never was a bishop at all! But there were reasons why he would naturally be inclined to view them with an unfavourable eye, and to lend a ready ear to any idle gossip against them. He was a German by extraction, and therefore his hereditary sympathies would be with the Hanoverians; he was a Whig by principle, and therefore his personal sympathies would not be with those who represented Toryism in its extremest form; he had already received favours from the existing Government and expected, and received, more. But there was a matter which came more closely home to him than this. One of the ablest of the Nonjurors, Jeremy Collier, had attacked him on a very tender point. There is no more sensitive being than a new writer about his first work; and Collier, in his crusade against the immorality of the stage, had singled out Cibber's first play for a rather captious animadversion. Cibber generously owned that Collier produced a good result by his crusade, but it is evident that he felt sore, and not unnaturally, about the attack upon himself. Far too much importance has been

assigned to this play, which was not even one of Cibber's best. Dean Plumptre thinks 'Cibber's transformation of Molière's "Tartuffe" into the "Dr. Wolf" of his once popular comedy, "The Nonjuror," though doubtless a libel and a caricature on the class, could scarcely have won the applause of crowded theatres if it had not been felt that it bore, in some cases, only too close a resemblance to the original.'[1] But those who have closely studied the mind of the period, and have therefore realised the frantic alarm and dislike which 'the Pretender' and all who were in any way connected with his cause aroused, will own that crowds would be quite ready to applaud anything derogatory to them without stopping to inquire whether it was true or not.

Enough, it is hoped, has now been said in this general survey of the subject to enable the reader to enter into the details which will be given in the following chapters.

[1] Plumptre's *Life of Bishop Ken*, ii. 75.

CHAPTER II

THE DEPRIVED FATHERS

THOSE who were fondly called 'the deprived Fathers,' that is, those prelates who declined to take the oath of allegiance to William and Mary in 1689, stand on quite a different footing from the rest of the Nonjurors. It was not that they were more able and learned than the rest; on the contrary, others will come before us who stood far above any of them in point of literary achievements. Nor was it that they suffered more; others gave up their all for conscience' sake, and they could not do more. But they were the 'fathers' of the family, and that in more senses than one; they were, in the first instance, the only members of it who belonged to the highest order of the ministry; and therefore it depended upon them alone to keep up the succession of the episcopate, and to supply the gaps which in the course of nature would occur in the thin ranks of the clergy. It was to *them* that the others looked up for guidance and counsel; *they* set the example, and the rest followed. Moreover, five out of the eight had been among the immortal seven who had gone to prison rather than execute the illegal orders of King James, the aim of which, according to general belief, was 'to bring in Popery and Arbitrary Power'; and as the Nonjurors were freely charged with desiring to bring in both it was a comfort and satisfaction to them to be able to point to the conduct of their 'fathers' on that memorable occasion in disproof of the charge. The

immense popularity which the bishops had then deservedly gained was now a help to the Nonjuring cause. It was no wonder, therefore, that the deprived Fathers were regarded with a reverence and possessed an authority which from the nature of the case could belong to none besides; and for these reasons, and also because things will have to be said about them which apply to no others, they require a separate treatment.

The names of these prelates were William Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury; Francis Turner, Bishop of Ely; John Lake, Bishop of Chichester; William Thomas, Bishop of Worcester; Thomas White, Bishop of Peterborough; Thomas Ken, Bishop of Bath and Wells; William Lloyd, Bishop of Norwich; Robert Frampton, Bishop of Gloucester; and (with a serious qualification) Thomas Cartwright, Bishop of Chester. Of these, Sancroft, Turner, Lake, White, and Ken had been among those who were imprisoned in the Tower in June 1688. Lloyd would also have been among the number had not the letter inviting him to London to take part in presenting the petition to King James miscarried by accident, or been intercepted; so also would Frampton, who was actually hurrying on his way to join in the presentation, but did not arrive in time;[1] and these two were always recognised by the rest as having been, if not actually, yet 'in full preparation of mind,' as themselves.[2] Cartwright stands in quite a different category from the rest. He died, indeed, in 1689; but if he had lived to be deprived, it would have been because he could not have avoided it; he had been so complete a tool of King James that he could never have been accepted by the Revolution Government, and his character and antecedents were such that

[1] See *Life of Frampton*, pp. 151–3.
[2] See Plumptre's *Life of Bishop Ken*, ii. 68.

he would never have been accepted by the Nonjurors, who regarded the whole question at least as much from a religious as from a political point of view. William Thomas also and John Lake died before the sentence of deprivation was carried out, the former in June, the latter in August 1689; but these were men of a very different type from Cartwright, and were gladly recognised by the Nonjurors as confessors for their cause, to which they were an honour when living, and which they strengthened by the testimony they bore to it when they were dying.

As a matter of fact, then, there were only five who were actually deprived; but Thomas and Lake were always included in their numbers, and what will be said of the other five will also apply to them. It was observed as a good omen that they were still the sacred number seven, 'the Bishop of Norwich, a man well-skilled in our laws, and the Bishop of Gloucester making up the number in the room of the bishops that fell from their principle, being able to suffer imprisonment only, but not the loss of all things.'[1] The two defaulters were William Lloyd, Bishop of St. Asaph, and Sir Jonathan Trelawney, Bishop of Bristol; and, with these two exceptions, the bishops who effectually resisted King James in the time of his power were the very same men who stood by him in his adversity, suffering, for the first, imprisonment, and for the second the loss of all their worldly goods and prospects. And, so far from there being any inconsistency between their conduct on the one occasion and on the other, it was exactly the same principle which actuated them on both, and exactly the same moral courage and supreme reverence for conscience on both which enabled them to carry that principle into action.

The curious result, however, was that the men who

[1] *Life of Bishop Frampton*, pp. 184–5.

were in a very real sense largely instrumental in bringing about the Revolution were the first to suffer from it.[1] The trial of the seven bishops was the proximate cause of the invitation to William of Orange to 'come over and deliver the English nation from Popery and Arbitrary Power;' the subsequent refusal of the bishops to comply with King James's command to them to draw up a paper expressing their abhorrence of the Prince's invasion prevented a serious hindrance to the success of the Prince's design;[2] for the bishops were then so popular that a declaration on their part would have weighed enormously with the general public. But such a declaration they could not conscientiously make, for they felt as much as any the need of intervention. Thus they rendered very material assistance to the Revolution; and the reward which they received for their services was the despoiling of their goods and the absolute ruin of all their worldly prospects.

It may be urged that the Revolution Government could not help itself, for no government can subsist which does not enforce its own laws. But was it wise, was it necessary, to *make* a *new* law requiring the clergy who held any office to take the oaths afresh? It had never been required before on the accession of a new sovereign; and if it be said that the doubtfulness of the new sovereign's tenure rendered what was unnecessary before necessary now, the argument on the other side is surely far more weighty. Was it a time to drive very

[1] Bishop Vowler Short brings this point out very well. See his *History of the Church of England*, § 803.

[2] There is a most interesting paper among the Rawlinson MSS. (D 836) written, no doubt, by Bishop Turner, in which he defends at length the 'non-swearing Prelates'' conduct in the matter of 'the Abhorrence.' The *Diary of Henry, Earl of Clarendon*, 1687–90 (pp. 495–502), also gives some vivid and interesting details.

valuable and influential men into a corner? Was it not emphatically a time to be conciliatory, to put no needless strain upon men whose past conduct showed, on the one hand, that they would never do anything to bring in popery and arbitrary power, and, on the other, that their consciences would be extremely sensitive as to the sanctity of an oath?

It is, however, as ecclesiastics, not as politicians, that the deprived Fathers appeal to our sympathies. Many will think—though the thought would be quite foreign to the feeling of the seventeenth century—that the less they interfered with politics the better. For, truth to tell, their political wisdom does not appear to have been remarkable. They were all for a Regency. But was it reasonable to suppose that a keen and ambitious statesman and soldier, like William of Orange, would come over with an armed force to 'deliver' a country which he never loved, and then go back again? Or, that he would ever be content with the strange position of having a *roi fainéant* in the background—in other words, with doing all the work and incurring all the responsibility, while another held the honour?

But when we pass from what was called in the language of the time 'the State point' to 'the Church point,' the case is quite different. The bishops were here on their proper ground, and it was hard to dislodge them from it by argument. This seems to have been clearly perceived by the new Government, which showed considerable forbearance, and made various attempts to conciliate the recalcitrants. The sees were kept vacant for some time in order that the late Nonjuring holders might be won over. At length a conspiracy against the Government was detected, or, as some think, fabricated, in which the Nonjuring bishops were suspected of being

concerned, and this, as William's chief ecclesiastical adviser naïvely puts it, 'gave the King a great advantage in filling up these vacant sees.'[1] But he met with some rebuffs. Dr. Sharp, then Dean of St. Paul's, previously Dean of Norwich, a man very generally respected,

had the choice of two or three bishoprics offered to him: Norwich, which was thought would be most acceptable to him on account of the friendships he had in that city, was pressed upon him by Tillotson. But he waived all these offers on account of the dispossessed bishops being yet alive; in regard to Norwich, he declared that, having lived in great friendship with its Bishop, he could not think of taking his place.

Indeed, he asserted roundly that it was 'quite impossible for him to build his rise upon the ruins of any one of the Fathers of the Church, who, for piety, good morals, and strictness of life, had left no equal.' And we are not surprised to learn that 'the King was not a little disgusted at his peremptory refusal of these preferments.'[2] Dr. South acted in the same way as Dr. Sharp, and is said to have used exactly the same words.[3] William Beveridge, perhaps the most highly esteemed and energetic clergyman then living, followed his example, and refused to take Bishop Ken's place at Bath and Wells. John Scott, one of the best devotional writers of the day, refused the bishopric of Chester and other posts. Tillotson himself was most reluctant to go to Canterbury. And can we wonder at it? The men whose posts they were to occupy were loyal Churchmen, of blameless, indeed exemplary character, men whose courage and consistency had helped to save the Church of England in a crisis of her fate; they were deprived by no Church

[1] Burnet's *History of My Own Time.*

[2] See *Life of John Sharp*, by his Son, pp. 108–9. Also Dean Luckock's *Bishops in the Tower*, p. 199.

[3] *Memoirs of the Life of Dr. Robert South*, prefixed to his *Posthumous Works* (vol. vii. of Sermons), p. 115.

authority, but simply by an Act of Parliament; and through the same civil power their successors were to be appointed. It looked very like reducing the Church to a mere appanage of the State.

Of course the Nonjuring clergy regarded the deprived prelates as still being their spiritual fathers, and urged them to continue to exercise their episcopal functions by ordaining clergy and consecrating bishops to keep up the succession. The latter wish involved a very serious question which must be discussed a little further. They consented to it, but were by no means unanimous. Bishop Ken disliked it extremely, though at last he reluctantly yielded. Bishop Frampton held quite aloof. Archbishop Sancroft sanctioned the measure, and, indeed, nominated the first new bishop, but he died before the consecrations actually took place. The matter, therefore, was left in the hands of Bishops Lloyd, Turner and White, who, on St. Matthias' Day, 1693–4, clandestinely consecrated in the house of Mr. Gifford, of Southgate, where White lodged, George Hickes to be Suffragan Bishop of Thetford, and Thomas Wagstaffe, of Ipswich. A fuller account of the matter will come in more appropriately in the next chapter. But so far as the 'deprived Fathers' were concerned, it must be noted that the greatest care was taken that everything should be done regularly, and that a door should be left open for a reunion with 'the Establishment' when a favourable opportunity occurred. Lloyd —to whom Sancroft had delegated his archiepiscopal powers, and who must henceforth be regarded as the head of the Nonjuring communion—was careful that both the new bishops should be connected with the diocese, of which he still considered himself, and was considered by his brethren, the lawful incumbent; they were allowed to exercise no episcopal functions; they had no districts

assigned to them, Thetford and Ipswich being merely their titles; indeed, they had not even the *titles* of bishops ordinarily assigned to them; they were consecrated simply to prevent the succession from being broken.

But, in spite of all these precautions, the deprived Fathers have been very generally and severely blamed by Churchmen for their action in this matter. And it is not surprising that they should have been; for, granted that the separation had already taken place, the new consecrations certainly tended to exasperate it, and to render the possibility of a reunion—a consummation devoutly to be wished for by all good Churchmen—much more remote. It was an act to which they should only have had recourse in the last resort, and have postponed to the latest possible moment; and they can hardly be acquitted of the charge of acting too hastily in a matter of such grave moment. It was quite different from an ordination; as they were still bishops of the Catholic Church, they were justified in continuing to ordain; and there were amply sufficient bishops still living to ordain the few who were likely to seek ordination at their hands; indeed, as a matter of fact, it was not until nearly twenty years later that the last of the deprived Fathers died.

At the same time, the question is a more difficult and complicated one than is commonly supposed; and we should not be in too great a hurry to condemn men who had done so much and suffered so much for the Church of England, to which, according to their lights, they were assuredly loyal to the backbone. There is no doubt that great pressure was put upon them, and touching appeals made to them. They were placed in a most awkward predicament. They were generous-minded men, and they might well shrink from even the *appearance* of meanness in leading their flocks into a most difficult position, and

then leaving them in the lurch. The Nonjurors, both clergy and laity, might urge with some force: You have taught us, both by example and precept, that the true Church of England lies in our little remnant; that we are bound to adhere to it, at the expense not only of our worldly advancement, but of our practical usefulness; and now, having led us into the wilderness, are you going to leave us there, without making any provision which you alone can supply, of chief pastors to guide us, and indeed to continue our existence as a part of the Church Catholic when you are dead and gone?

The story of those fathers who belonged to the famous Seven has been told over and over again, and that in works which are both accessible and popular.[1] It will suffice, then, to limit the present account chiefly to that part of their history which is connected with the Nonjuring episode.

William Sancroft (1617–93) claims, of course, the first notice; not only because he was the highest in position, but because personally, more than any other, he gave, so to speak, the keynote to the rest. Sancroft, though no great writer, was essentially a bookish man, more at home in his library than in the conduct of affairs. This may, perhaps, give the clue to some apparent inconsistencies in his later conduct. Had he consulted his own inclination, he would probably have been happier as Master of Emmanuel than as Archbishop of Canterbury. As circumstances, however, had placed him, through no seeking of his own, in that exalted position, where he

[1] See Dean Luckock's *The Bishops in the Tower*; Miss A. Strickland's *Lives of the Seven Bishops*; Macaulay's *History of England*; Buckle's *History of Civilisation*; and the Lives of the individual bishops, such as D'Oyly's Life of Sancroft; Lives of Bishop Ken, by Hawkins, Plumptre, 'A Layman,' and Bowles; the Life of Bishop Frampton, by a contemporary, edited by Mr. Simpson Evans, &c.

was necessarily plunged into the vortex of public life, he carried out his principles unflinchingly; but he gladly took the opportunity of seeking his beloved retirement whenever he could do so without, in his opinion, violating any of those principles. There can be no doubt what his principles were: he was an English Churchman to the backbone—a High Churchman in the spiritual rather than in the political sense of the term. He had been trained in the school of the Caroline divines, and was so great an admirer of Laud—that is, of Laud the Churchman, not Laud the statesman—that it was the cherished project of his life to give to the world the famous 'Diary.'[1] His constant immersion in business never gave him time to carry out his project; but he enjoined it as an almost sacred duty upon his chaplain, Henry Wharton, by whom it was completed and edited after his death. Even of Laud the Churchman it was the *con*structive rather than the *de*structive work which he admired; for he showed a tenderness towards Dissenters which was not at all in the Laudian vein, and there was a marked change of policy on the side of leniency towards them when Sancroft succeeded Sheldon in the Primacy. He also projected a scheme of Comprehension, of the details of which one would have liked to have known more; for a scheme drawn up by a man of Sancroft's principles would never have compromised the Church as some such schemes did; while his obviously kind feelings towards Dissenters would have led him to go as far as a consistent Churchman could. He was brought into intimate relations with that stoutest of stout Churchmen, John Cosin, whom he aided, pecuniarily and otherwise, in the time of 'the troubles.' Cosin amply repaid the obligation after the Restoration, bringing Sancroft into his diocese, making him his

[1] He spent his last days in preparing *Memorials of Archbishop Laud.*

domestic chaplain, giving him a rich living and a prebend in Durham, and being ready also to provide him with a good wife. The latter favour Sancroft declined, as he was not a marrying man. No one could well be an intimate friend of Cosin without being strengthened in his Churchmanship; and Sancroft's was no doubt strengthened by his two years' sojourn (1661–63) in the diocese of Durham. But long before that time he had shown the firmness of his Church principles by refusing to take 'the Engagement,' and in consequence losing his fellowship at Emmanuel in 1651, and by writing two works which must have been unacceptable to the ruling powers. After the Restoration his rise was rapid. In 1662 he was elected Master of Emmanuel College, Cambridge—a remarkable instance of the estimation in which he was held personally; for the electors were more or less Puritans, and therefore their ecclesiastical sympathies would not be with Sancroft. In the early part of 1664 he became Dean of York, and at the close of the same year Dean of St. Paul's; and then, in 1678, he rose at a bound to the Primacy, to the surprise and annoyance of some over whose heads he passed. He left his mark, in the literal as well as the figurative sense of the term, in all these places: the building of the College chapel of Emmanuel was commenced in his mastership, and he subscribed largely to it; during his short stay at York he expended two hundred pounds more on the fabric than the whole income he received; at St. Paul's he rebuilt the deanery, and was the very life and soul of the project for rebuilding the Cathedral after the Great Fire of 1666, and to this fund also he subscribed largely. It seemed necessary to dwell on these points because he has been accused of avarice. In the Revolution crisis he was very prominent. It was Sancroft who drew up the petition to King James

respecting the Declaration of Indulgence; Sancroft who first propounded the Regency scheme; Sancroft who set the example of declining the oath of allegiance to William and Mary; Sancroft who, in a sense, established the Nonjuring communion; Sancroft who was mainly responsible for continuing the succession of the Nonjuring episcopate.

Such a man would be sure to make strong friends and strong enemies. But there can be no doubt that he was looked up to by his contemporaries to an extent which his high position is by no means sufficient to account for. Bishop Turner, of Ely, wrote to him in his own name and that of his brother prelates, January 11, 1688–9, asking him to 'draw up propositions of our doctrine against deposing, electing, or breaking the succession.' 'This scheme,' he says, 'we humbly and earnestly beg of your Grace to form and put in order for us. Without compliment, your Grace is better versed than all of us put together in those repositories of canons and statutes whence these propositions should be taken.'[1] Bishop Nicolson, a man of a very different type and very different opinions, wrote a letter to a clergyman on May 15, 1689, persuading him to conform to the new *régime*. He answers three objections, and one of them is the weight of Archbishop Sancroft's example, which he evidently thinks a very grave one.[2] Bishop Burnet, on the other hand, bears very hardly upon Sancroft in his 'History of My Own Time;' but Burnet's allegations are indignantly denied by men of very varied opinions, such as Swift, South, Granger, Salmon, and Lord Dartmouth, while Dryden's panegyric of him, under the name of Zadok, is classical.[3]

[1] D'Oyly's *Life of Sancroft*, i. 420.

[2] Bishop Nicolson's *Epistolary Correspondence*, ii. 9.

[3] See Miss Strickland's *Lives of the Seven Bishops*, p. 102; Swift's *Ode to Archbishop Sancroft's Memory*; Lord Dartmouth's *Notes on Burnet*,

At the crisis of the Revolution the infirmities of age were beginning to tell upon Sancroft, and his old love of retirement and learned leisure was returning to him with redoubled force. This may serve to explain several passages in his conduct. For instance, one can perfectly well understand why, as a sound Churchman, he refused to act on the High Commission, which the infatuated James revived in 1687, setting a layman, and so objectionable a layman as Judge Jeffreys, at its head; but it would surely have been better to say boldly that he objected to act because it was illegal, irregular, and contrary to all sound Churchmanship, instead of pleading, as he did, age and infirmities as the cause of his refusal. James naturally replied that the same cause must prevent him from appearing at Court or in Council; and accordingly on more than one occasion when his presence would have been most desirable he did not appear. Again, no one can be surprised at his refusal to crown William and Mary, or to consecrate Burnet to the bishopric of Salisbury; but it *did* seem a strange ignoring of the dictum, 'Qui facit per alium, facit per se,' when he issued a Commission empowering the Bishop of London and any three suffragans of his province to act in his name, and do what he could not conscientiously do himself. It seemed also a strange course, considering the prominent part he had taken, to retire entirely from public affairs after the memorable meeting of the Peers at the Guildhall in the spring of 1689. At that meeting Sancroft and the other bishops signed a declaration to the Prince of Orange, asking him to call a Free Parliament, and binding themselves to assist him in rescuing the nation

iii. 102; Granger's *Biographical History of England*, iii. 102; N. Salmon's *Lives of the English Bishops from the Restoration to the Revolution*; Dryden's *Absalom and Achitophel*.

from its dangers and disorders. This was the last public measure in which Sancroft bore any part.[1] In vain Lord Clarendon, among others, entreated him to attend, at any rate, *one* meeting of the Convention Parliament.[2] His presence, of course, was urgently needed, because it was there that his own scheme of a Regency, which was all but carried in the House of Peers,[3] was discussed. One can understand his objection to the Lower House, as not possessing the proper legal qualification of a parliamentary assembly, but this would surely not apply to the Upper Chamber.

Again, it was at least a doubtful proceeding on his part obstinately to decline to leave Lambeth until he was forcibly ejected; if he so acted because he thought himself bound to cling to the ship to the last, in the hope that a crash might still be avoided, it showed a strange lack of judgment considering the pass to which matters had come; if he did it to create as much trouble to the Government as possible, it was not a very dignified course to take.

And, finally, it showed an extraordinary lack of discrimination on his part to publish in the interest of the Nonjurors 'Overall's Convocation Book,' that is, the account drawn up by Bishop Overall of the Canons promulged in 1606, which really tended quite the other way. It is a curious thing that in the voluminous controversy which this publication evoked, no stress appears to have been laid upon one significant fact. The very reason why the 'Book' had so long been in abeyance was that King James I., who, in spite of all his absurdities, had a remarkably clear and shrewd head, forbade

[1] See D'Oyly's *Life of Sancroft*, i. 395–6.
[2] See *Diary of Henry, Earl of Clarendon*, p. 247.
[3] See Burnet's *History of My Own Time*, ii. 526–7.

its publication because one of its Canons (the XXVIIth) decreed that a king *de facto* who was not *de jure* might be accepted. Why, that was one of the principles for which the *Jurors* contended and which the *Non*jurors denied! And so the arch-Nonjuror, Sancroft, was really putting a weapon into his opponents' hands. One, at least, of the ablest of the Nonjurors, William Sherlock, who was probably casting about for some decent pretext for changing sides, seized it at once, and used it with great force.[1]

But Sancroft, in spite of some weaknesses, was not only a good and conscientious, but also an able and learned man. His words on his deathbed, 'What I have done I have done in the integrity of my heart, indeed, in the great integrity of my heart,' were, I believe, applicable to all his conduct, strange as that conduct sometimes was. The Nonjurors, as a body, always regarded him as the chief bulwark of their cause; and men do not often make mistakes about matters in which *de vitâ et sanguine agitur*; they know who are their best and strongest friends.[2] The touching words on his tomb at Fressingfield (his native place whither he retired to die), which are of his own framing, tell the true tale of his life:

> William Sancroft, borne in this parish, afterwards by the same Providence of God, Archbishop of Canterbury, and at last deprived of all that he could not keep with a good conscience, returned hither to end his life where he began it, and professeth here at the foot of his tomb that as he naked came forth, so he naked must return. The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away, blessed be the Name of the Lord.

[1] Among the Rawlinson MSS. in the Bodleian Library is an able letter from Sherlock to Sancroft on the subject.

[2] See, *inter alia*, the touching and eloquent *Letter out of Suffolk to a Friend in London, giving some Account of the last Sickness and Death of Dr. William Sancroft, late Archbishop of Canterbury*. It was published anonymously, but the writer was undoubtedly Thomas Wagstaffe, the elder. See *infra*, p. 117.

Whither his thoughts turned at the last may be gathered from these two petitions which he put up less than an hour before death:

(1) That God would Bless and Preserve this poor Suffering Church which by this Revolution is almost destroyed;

(2) That He would Bless and Preserve the King, Queen, and Prince; and in His due time to restore them to their just and undoubted rights.

He died at Fressingfield in November 1693, and was buried in Fressingfield churchyard.

At the very beginning of the separation Sancroft delegated his archiepiscopal authority to the deprived Bishop of Norwich (Dr. Lloyd), who was thus from the first the real head of the Nonjurors.

William Lloyd (1637–1710) was a Welshman by birth and education, being born at Bala, in Merionethshire, and educated at Ruthin School, until his admission as a sizar at St. John's College, Cambridge, in February 1654–5. He had a varied experience in the Ministry. He first served as chaplain to the English Merchants' Factory in Portugal; he was then made vicar of Battersea, then chaplain to the Lord Treasurer Clifford, then (1672) Prebendary of St. Paul's, then (1676) Bishop of Llandaff, then (1679) Bishop of Peterborough, and finally (1685) Bishop of Norwich. There is no evidence, so far as I am aware, to show that he was inefficient in any of these capacities. On the contrary he had the reputation of being an excellent preacher, and is said to have owed his early elevation to the Bench to this reputation; he was certainly an active and efficient bishop, and his loss was especially lamented at Llandaff, when he was translated to Peterborough. During the short time of his incumbency of Norwich before the Revolution (1685–8),

he won the confidence and affection of the diocese in a very remarkable degree. One who knew the circumstances well, and lived only in the next generation, affirms that 'in him the diocese was deprived [when he became a Nonjuror] of a very able and worthy pastor, a man of great integrity and piety, who thoroughly understood all the parts and duties of his function, and had a mind fully bent to put them all in execution for the honour of God and good of the Church on all occasions.'[1] The friendship of the dean (Dr. Sharp) has been already noticed; on account of that friendship Sharp absolutely refused to succeed him, and gladly joined in a petition that some way might be found for retaining his services. The petition was proposed by Luke Milbourne, the younger, who was then a beneficed clergyman in the diocese, and was a very different type of man from Lloyd. Mr. Milbourne has written a most vivid account of the affair, beginning: 'At a numerous meeting of the clergy I proposed that we should join in a petition to the Government, that the rigour of the depriving Act might be mitigated, and our Bishop might be permitted to live and exercise his Episcopal function among us. To this all subscribed very freely.'[2] It should be added that Mr. Milbourne himself never became a Nonjuror, but accepted afterwards more than one piece of preferment in the 'Revolution Church.'

Another instance of the confidence which his diocese had in the Bishop of Norwich appears in an Appendix to the contemporary Life of Kettlewell. It is in the form of a 'Letter from the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of

[1] *Life of Dr. Humphry Prideaux, Dean of Norwich*, published in 1748, p. 73.

[2] See *A Legacy to the Church of England, Vindicating her Orders from the Objections of Papists and Dissenters*, ii. 341.

Sudbury, lying under suspension, to their Diocesan, William, Bishop of Norwich,' and runs thus:

We, your Lordship's Curates, neighbours to Dr. Bisby,[1] lying under suspension, and (which is worse) very hard censures from most we converse withal, and finding the time of our deprivation to be near at hand, do take the boldness by him to beg your Lordship's Blessing, and withal earnestly to crave your Lordship's direction. For though we can think of nothing but losing all, yet we are passionately desirous to be instructed how we shall leave our respective cures, whether voluntarily, or stay till particular Intruders thrust us out by pretext of law: As also, which way to behave ourselves, to preserve (if possible) the old Church of England. We believe your Lordship thinks, and we are bold to say, you shall find us dutiful in anything you command or enjoin, as you shall think will serve for the interest of the Church.

Then follow nine signatures and the names of their cures.[2]

There were more Nonjurors in the diocese of Norwich than in any other diocese except London;[3] and the reason seems to be simply the influence of its bishop, and the respect which he had inspired.

It was a great disappointment to Bishop Lloyd that he was prevented from being a Confessor for the Church of England by joining in the Petition to King James II. which led to the imprisonment of the seven bishops in the Tower. He visited them in prison, took an active part in helping them to prepare their defence, and in fact so identified himself with their cause, that he was warned that 'he might yet keep company with them.' The two with whom he was most associated were Sancroft and Ken. The biographer of the former tells us that 'William Lloyd, Bishop of Norwich, was a person

[1] For an account of Dr. Bisby or Bisbie, see *infra*, pp. 224–6.

[2] See Kettlewell's *Compleat Works, with Life*, i. Appendix, No. 2.

[3] Unless, indeed, we count the Nonjurors resident at the two Universities as belonging to the dioceses of Oxford and Ely respectively; but they seem to me to belong to a different category.

in whose wisdom and integrity Archbishop Sancroft placed the greatest confidence.'[1] Lloyd influenced the archbishop quite as much as the archbishop influenced him. Sancroft was the more learned, but Lloyd was the stronger character of the two. With Ken he was associated in 1685 in a laudable effort to 'bring about a greater vigilance in the admission of candidates to holy orders;'[2] and the correspondence between the two old friends, though, alas! for one short period rather unfriendly, is most interesting and voluminous.

In the Revolution crisis Bishop Lloyd identified himself heart and soul with the Nonjurors. We find him visiting the Nonjuring Bishop of Chichester (Dr. Lake), on his deathbed in 1689, and after he had read Lake's famous 'Profession,' desiring the Dean of Worcester (Dr. Hickes) 'to carry it with him to Lambeth.'[3] He joined with the other prelates in indignantly repudiating any share in producing 'The Jacobite Liturgy,' which created so great a sensation in 1690; but his known principles made him suspected; and in the riots which broke out against the Jacobites after the defeat of the English and Dutch fleets by the French off Beachy Head just before the battle of the Boyne, his London house in Old Street was attacked by the mob, and he himself with his wife and child obliged to take refuge in the Temple.[4]

Sancroft had so high an opinion of Lloyd that in a formal document, dated February 9, 1691-2, 'from my poor cottage (which is not yet made a sufficient covering for me in this sharp winter) here in Fressingfield, at this

[1] D'Oyly's *Life of Sancroft*, i. 269, note. See also *Life of Ken*, by a Layman, pp. 586–7.

[2] Mr. Abbey's *English Church and its Bishops*, i. 169.

[3] See *History of the College of S. John the Evangelist, Cambridge*, by T. Baker, edited by J. E. B. Mayor, part ii. p. 687.

[4] See Plumptre's *Life of Ken*, ii. 66.

time indeed very hard frozen,[1] situate within the bounds of your diocese,' he delegated to him all his archiepiscopal powers.[2]

Kettlewell's first biographer says that Sancroft selected Lloyd, as being his eldest suffragan. But this was only be-

[1] This is, of course, a play upon words, which Sancroft, after the fashion of Bishop Andrewes and those of that date, was fond of making.

[2] The delegation runs: 'Wilhelmus, Providentiâ Divinâ Ecclesiæ Metrop. Cant. humilis minister, reverendo admodum in Christo patri, et fratri in Domino charissimo, Gulielmo, eâdem Providentiâ etiamnum Nordovicensi Episcopo, salutem et fraternam in Domino charitatem: Cum ego nuper ex ædibus Lambhithianis vi laicâ pulsus, et non inveniens in urbe vicinâ ubi tuto possem, aut commode commorari, procul secesserim, quærens ubi fessus senio requiescerem, multa autem jam tum remanserint, et emergent quotidie plura, eaque momenti maximi, Dei scilicet et Ecclesiæ negotia, nullibi ita commode atque expedite ac in magno illo rerum gerundarum theatro transingenda; tibi igitur, frater dilectissime, qui pro eâ quâ polles animi fortitudine, et pio, quo flagras, zelo domus Dei, adhuc in suburbis Londinensibus (palantibus undique cæteris) moraris et permanes, adeo ut neminem illuc habeam ita ισοψυχον, quique ita γνησιως rerum mearum et ecclesiæ satagat, tibi, inquam, ad hæc omnia pensitanda, et finaliter expedienda, hoc quicquid est muneris mei et pontificii, fretus prudentiâ tuâ et solitâ in rebus gerendis solertiâ, committo in Domino, teque Vicarium meum ad præmissa rerumque mearum et negotiorum actorem, factorem et nuntium generalem, vigore harum literarum eligo, facio et constituo. . . . Dicam summariè et de plano, quoscunque tu, frater, prout res et occasio tulerit, assumpseris et adjunxeris tibi, elegeris et approbaveris, confirmaveris et constitueris, Ego quoque (quantum in me est et de jure possum) assumo pariter et adjungo, eligo et approbo, confirmo et constituo. Uno verbo, quicquid in istius modi negotiis feceris ipse aut faciendum duxeris, id omne quantum et qualecunque illud fuerit, mihi audenter imputa. Ecce Ego Wilhelmus manu meâ scripsi. Ego præstabo non solum ratum sed et gratum insuper habiturus. Splendor autem Domini Dei nostri sit super te, frater, et opera manuum tuarum dirigat et confirmet. Quin et eripiat te, fratresque nostros omnes ex ore leonis, et de manu canis, et a cornibus unicornium exaudiat vos. Mactetque denique et cumulet omni benedictione spirituali in cælestibus in Christo Jesu.

Datum e proprio conducto (quod enim mihi molior tugurium superveniente acri hyeme nondum exædificatum est) hic in campo gelido, nunc etiam profundè gelato, sito intra tuæ diœceseos pomœria, nono die Februarii, Anno Domini, 1691°.

W. Cant.

Actum in præsentiâ meâ, W. Sancroft, jun., Notarii publici.

There is also an English copy, and it is not quite clear whether the English was a translation of the Latin or the Latin of the English. Sancroft probably wrote both.

cause Lloyd attained a bishopric at an unusually early age. In point of years, Lloyd was one of the youngest, if not *the* youngest, of all the 'invalidly deprived Fathers.' The real reason was rather that Sancroft thought Lloyd the man best fitted for the post. He dwells on his fortitude of mind and his pious zeal, as shown in his dwelling near the centre, London, where he would be most accessible, but at the same time most in danger, and to his activity in business. Lloyd seems to me to have fully justified Sancroft's choice. He was placed in a very trying situation as head of a shadowy episcopate, with which, however, a great number of both clergy and laity were in their heart of hearts in sympathy; or at any rate, for whom, in the euphemistic language of a contemporary, they 'had a reserved kindness.' An injudicious, hot-headed man might, under such circumstances, have created endless disorder and trouble, especially if he were, like Bishop Lloyd, a Nonjuror of the extreme type and an ardent Jacobite to boot; but Lloyd managed his flock with great firmness and judgment; and both the Established Church and the civil Government had reason to be grateful to him if they had only known it. Indeed, some who threw in their lot entirely with the new Government *did* know it. Dr. White Kennett, for instance, who will hardly be suspected of partiality for a pronounced Nonjuror, bears this remarkable testimony to Lloyd's good management of his delicate task:

> The character given of him by his Metropolitan is above any other that can be given. And the trust which he reposed in him is certainly so great, as nothing possibly could be greater. Whether one or the other were in the right, either he in giving or this in accepting, is not the question. How likewise he discharged the high trust committed to him, and with what prudence and piety he transacted matters relating to it, so as not to give thereby any umbrage to the Government, or as little as

possible, will be proper for an Ecclesiastical Historian of those times to explain distinctly.[1]

And Dr. D'Oyly, who strongly disapproves of Lloyd's action in the matter of the new consecrations, also testifies to his prudence and caution.[2]

The men with whom Lloyd was bound to come into collision were the moderate Nonjurors, and he *did* come into a temporary collision with one of the very best of them—Bishop Ken. Ken never approved of the commission given by Sancroft to Lloyd, and protested against it. Lloyd indeed writes (May 9, 1691), 'I have been able to silence the phancifull objections of my brother.' But Sancroft seems still doubtful, and replies, 'I am glad if our good Brother is satisfied concerning his former objection against my Commission.'[3] Ken probably saw, what anyone who reads between the lines can see, that the commission extended, by implication, to making new consecrations of bishops, to which he strongly objected; and Lloyd must have felt in honour bound, by his acceptance of the commission, to join in making them, if required. However, the matter was tided over; and Ken and Lloyd were in amicable and frequent correspondence until the close of 1703, when the question of Ken's cession of his diocese to Hooper arose. Then there was a sharp contention between the two good men, which almost reminds one of the sharp contention between St. Paul and St. Barnabas. They really were at cross-purposes. Ken only thought of keeping the *depositum* of the faith safe, and he was sure that this would be done by the like-minded Hooper. Lloyd quite agreed with Ken in his high opinion of Hooper, and expressed it strongly both before and during the dispute.

[1] Quoted in Brydges' *Restituta*, i. 577.
[2] See D'Oyly's *Life of Sancroft*, ii. 32.
[3] Plumptre's *Life of Ken*, ii. 76–7.

But that was not the point; a man may be an excellent man, and yet have no right to occupy a post to which he is not lawfully appointed; and that was just what Lloyd thought with regard to Hooper. Ken suspected that Lloyd was drawing back from the views which he had expressed, through fear of his Jacobite friends. But Lloyd seems to me to explain his conduct quite clearly and satisfactorily. If those who appointed Hooper had the right to appoint him, he would warmly have welcomed the appointment of so good a Churchman and so good a man. But one of the very *raisons d'être* of the Nonjurors was that the intruders into sees not canonically vacant, not being themselves lawful bishops, were *not* the persons to consecrate others.

Bishop Lloyd lived for nearly twenty years of his life at Hammersmith, then a suburb, though not a very distant suburb, of London. There 'he governed his Church with piety, candour, and zeal, of which many instances might be produced, handed down to us by the clergy of his different dioceses.'[1] In his later years he held a position among the Nonjurors which from the nature of the case was unique. All but three of the 'invalidly deprived Fathers' had passed away. Two of the three, Ken and Frampton, had virtually ceased to be members of the Nonjuring community, though they never actually took the oaths. Lloyd alone was left, and he was evidently regarded with a reverence to which no one else could aspire. Men went to see him, as on a pilgrimage, to ask his blessing. He died on New Year's Day, 1710, and the event is thus noted by the learned Thomas Smith in a letter to Hearne:

The same day my misfortune befell mee [he had had a bad

[1] *Lives of the English Bishops from the Restoration to the Revolution*, by N. Salmon, 1733; *sub nomine* Lloyd, William.

fall] dyed the truly venerable Bp. Lloyd of Norwich: a very wise man and an undaunted Confessor of this depressed and afflicted Church; upon whose life rolles Mr. Dodwell's odd hypothesis in his 'Case in View.'[1] What will be the consequences of it, time only must shew. I went to Hammersmithe on H. Innocents' Day to receive this good Bps last blessing: and it added to my paine new degrees of trouble that I could not attend upon him to his grave.[2]

The learned Thomas Baker, who occupied somewhat the same position at Cambridge that Thomas Smith did at Oxford, writes also in terms of the highest praise of Bishop Lloyd.[3] That Sancroft was greatly influenced by prudential motives in his choice of Lloyd as his vicar-general seems probable from the fact of his preferring him to the next bishop who comes under our notice—a rather older and much more prominent man.

Francis Turner (1636–1700) was by far the most active and zealous of all the deprived Fathers in behalf of the exiled Stuarts. His life before the Revolution had been simply that of an earnest and active priest, and afterwards bishop, in full sympathy with the teaching of the Caroline divines, with some of whom he had held the closest intimacy. From the time when they were schoolfellows together at Winchester he maintained a very close friendship with Thomas Ken, which was slightly, but only slightly, interrupted towards the last by rather divergent views on the subject of the Revolution. Like Ken, he proceeded from Winchester to New College, Oxford, where both of them were scholars and fellows together. He took Holy Orders, and in 1664 was presented to the living of Therfield, in Herts, in succession to that staunch Churchman, John Barwick. It was pro-

[1] See *infra*, p. 235.

[2] See Hearne's *Collections*, Oxf. Hist. Soc., ii. 335 and note.

[3] See *History of St. John's College, Cambridge*, by T. Baker; edited by J. E. B. Mayor, pp. 270–1.

bably this that brought him into intercourse with Peter Gunning, then Master of St. John's College, Cambridge, though he may have known him, at least by reputation, before; for Gunning had been chaplain at New College. Gunning was a great divine of the Laudian school, and just the man to influence such a one as Turner. He persuaded him to become incorporated at Cambridge, soon after his institution to Therfield, and in 1664 Turner was admitted as a fellow-commoner of St. John's. In 1670 he succeeded Gunning in the mastership of the college. In 1683 he became rector of Great Haseley, and in the same year was made, first, Dean of Windsor, and then Bishop of Rochester. Finally, in 1684, he again succeeded his friend and patron, Gunning, as Bishop of Ely. But he had a more powerful friend than Gunning. He was chaplain to the Duke of York, and when the duke became king in 1685, Bishop Turner preached the Coronation sermon. James was always his steady friend and patron, and there is no doubt that Turner conceived for him a deep personal attachment, which accounts to a great extent for the bishop's future conduct. But this attachment did not prevent him from taking an independent line of his own. He had no scruple about offending James by preaching before him 'a very severe sermon against the errors of the Romish Church on November 5, 1685,'[1] and he bravely protested against James's proceedings after the suppression of the Monmouth rebellion. He also joined heartily the ranks of the seven bishops who presented the Petition to the King about the Declaration of Indulgence, and was one of the imprisoned. In fact, in the language of a contemporary, he was

as zealous as any one of the Seven Bishops in setting himself against two contrary religious factions then united at Court, and

[1] *Lives of the Seven Bishops*, by Agnes Strickland, p. 178.

in opposing the King's intentions about the Declaration of Indulgence; but is said to have very heartily afterwards repented for having gone so far therein as he did, and to have acknowledged that their going to the Tower, when they might easily have prevented the same by entering into mutual recognisances for each other, as the King would have had them, was a wrong step taken, and an unnecessary punctilio of honour in Christian bishops.[1]

The whole of this description is exactly what one would expect. Bishop Turner opposed King James out of the very love he bore him, for he felt it was the part of true friendship to try to rescue him from evil counsellors; but he never intended matters to go so far as they did; and there is an air of painful surprise in his exclamation when the King accused the seven of being rebels: 'We rebels! We would die at your Majesty's feet!' One can well understand his bitter regret when he found that the refusal of himself and his brethren to take the advice of Lord Clarendon, and enter into recognisances for one another,[2] led to King James's downfall—a regret which it is said that Sancroft also shared.

When the catastrophe came, Turner of course did not hesitate one moment about refusing the new oaths; and there seems to me to be no moral doubt, though there might be legal ones, that henceforth he set himself heart and soul to the work of restoring his beloved master. Another of the seven, Bishop Lloyd, of St. Asaph, tried in vain to influence him in favour of William and Mary; Turner replied, 'he would never take an oath to any monarch during the life of James II.,' and on Lloyd's further asking 'what he would do if James were dead?' 'It is possible,' he said, 'I might take the oath to his successor,' evidently meaning his son.[3] In that very

[1] *Life and Compleat Works of John Kettlewell*, i. 168.

[2] See *Diary of Henry, Earl of Clarendon*, for June 7, 1688, p. 175.

[3] *Lives of the Seven Bishops*, by Agnes Strickland, p. 196.

interesting contemporary record, Lord Clarendon's Diary, we have many notices of Bishop Turner at this time. On December 31, 1689, Clarendon writes:

> The Bishop of Ely was with me, and told me that the Bps. of London [Compton] and S. Asaph [Lloyd] had been with Lord Canterbury [Sancroft—*sic*] to know what he and the rest could do to prevent being deprived; that Feb. 1 drew near. Could they make no steps towards the government? Some expedients they proposed, as that a short bill should be passed, giving the king power to dispense with them [the oaths?] during pleasure; to all which the Archbishop, Norwich and Ely said they could do nothing; if the king thought it for his own sake that they should not be deprived, he must make it his business; they could not vary from what they had done.[1]

'The Archbishop, Norwich and Ely,' these were the three irreconcilables—but for them, matters might possibly have taken a different course; and Ely was the most irreconcilable of all. When the fatal 1st of February arrived, and he was deprived, Turner protested against the validity of the sentence in the Market Place of Ely, and continued to preach every Sunday in his robes in the chapel of Ely House, Hatton Garden.[2] Lord Clarendon was one of his regular congregation, and frequently refers to the chapel services in his diary.[3]

Turner joined with the rest of his brethren in their indignant repudiation of the charge, made by the anonymous author of the 'Modest Enquiry,' that they were the authors of the Jacobite Liturgy; in which repudiation they also added that they never held any correspondence with France; that they were concerned in no plots, and that they should make it their practice to study to be quiet, to bear their cross patiently, and to seek the good of their native country. 'We have,' they add, 'all of us not long

[1] *Diary of Henry, Earl of Clarendon*, p. 299.
[2] *Lives of the Seven Bishops*, by A. Strickland, p. 201.
[3] *Diary*, pp. 303–4, January 30, 1690–1, February 11, &c.

since, either actually, or in full preparation of mind, hazarded all we had in opposing Popery and arbitrary power in England' (this was perfectly true of Turner as well as of the rest), 'and we shall, by God's grace, with greater zeal again sacrifice all we have, and our very lives, too, if God shall be pleased to call us thereto, to prevent Popery, and the arbitrary power of France, from coming upon us and prevailing over us.' This 'Vindication' Turner signed in July 1690. In December 1690 he was suspected of being involved in Lord Preston's plot, and it has not been obscurely hinted that he must have committed perjury. This is a grave charge to bring against a Christian bishop, and the facts must be looked into. By some writers the Gordian knot has been boldly cut in two different ways: (1) by denying that there was any genuine plot at all; (2) by denying that there is any sufficient evidence that the compromising letters were written by Turner.

Anthony Wood's account of the affair runs thus: 'In December 1690 there was a pretended discovery of a pretended plot of the Jacobites or Nonjurors, whereupon some of them were imprisoned; and Dr. Turner being suspected to be in the same pretended plot, he withdrew and absconded.'[1] Dean Luckock enters into the subject more at length, and comes to the same conclusion.[2] Miss Strickland, while not denying the reality of the plot, contends that there was not the slightest proof that the incriminating letters were written by Turner;[3] and Mr. Lathbury doubts whether there was any plot, and maintains (rightly) that it was never proved that the letters were written by Turner.[4] Dean Plumptre is

[1] *Athenæ Oxonienses, sub nomine* Turner, Francis.
[2] *The Bishops in the Tower*, by Dean Luckock, p. 197.
[3] *Lives of the Seven Bishops*, &c., by Agnes Strickland, pp. 201–2.
[4] *History of the Nonjurors*, p. 78.

evidently of opinion that there was a real plot and that the letters were really Turner's,[1] but acquits him of the charge of perjury, of which Lord Macaulay and others have insinuated that he was guilty.[2]

Dean Plumptre's view seems to me, on the whole, to be the correct one. The memorable words in the intercepted letters, which seemed to compromise all the deprived Fathers, and indeed the Nonjurors generally, were: 'I speak in the plural, because I write my elder brother's sentiments as well as my own, and the rest of the family, though lessened in number; yet if we are not mightily out in our accounts, we are growing in our interest, that is, in yours;' and in the second letter, 'I say this in behalf of my elder brother, and the rest of my nearest relations, as well as for myself.'[3] The letters are addressed to Mr. and Mrs. Redding, by whom, it has never been doubted, are meant King James and his Queen. That there was no *legal* proof against Turner, and that the idea of a plot, in which the Nonjuring prelates were involved, was eagerly seized upon without too close inquiry by the Government, as furnishing a very convenient pretext for filling up the sees, is fully admitted. But that the letters were really Turner's, that by his 'elder brother' he meant Sancroft, and by 'the rest of his nearest relations' the other Nonjuring prelates, that the expressions were intended to reassure King James that he had still powerful friends, that there was really 'a plot'—or, as the actors themselves would have put it, that 'measures were being taken to enable the King to enjoy his own again'—appears to me to be morally certain.

[1] *Life of Bishop Ken*, vol. ii. ch. xxi. pp. 70–1.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 82–3.

[3] Quoted by Mr. Lathbury (*Hist. of Nonjurors*, p. 78) from Ralph's *History of England*, ii. 255, where the correspondence is printed.

There seems at this time of day [says a writer of the next generation] to be little reason to deny or conceal what must at the long run turn out to his [Turner's] credit, viz.: loyalty and gratitude to his prince and patron, and zeal for the Church of which he was a bishop, and which at that crisis was in the utmost danger from the party which brought in the Revolution.[1]

This is written with express reference to the 'Preston Plot,' not to Turner's later conduct, about which there is no doubt; and its truth is surely borne out by Turner's own letter to Sancroft, written from his hiding-place, after a proclamation had been issued, and a reward offered for his discovery. The letter is worth quoting at some length.

You see, no disappointments or discouragements shall (by the grace of God) make me give over what I think my duty; though I am disabled from doing any service at home, and must seeke abroad; I have almost settled my business, and laid my designs a little better, I hope, than the unfortunate Lord did [2] to gett out of their clutches; for, after so fatall a miscarriage, I'me well aware, that there will bee no staying for me, unless I could find in my heart to make upp with the Government, which I abhor the thought of. It must at least cost me a long imprisonment, should I appeare, which is bad and hard enough, tho' I believe I could scarce bee a sufferer by any fair tryall. But what if it should prove a foule one? Upon the whole matter I thinke myself (blessed be God) mighty safe in my present concealment; and had I adjusted but the rest of my domestique settlements, I would vanish till another Revolution, if God lett me live to see it. Meantime I hope in God by the course I mean to take, I may putt myselfe into a better capacity than ever of serving the Church as well as my country. But to tell my resolutions more particularly is not desirable at present, nor convenient for you to know this: rather lett me leave you in condition to protest your innocense if examined hereafter. Nothing troubles me so much as that my intercepted

[1] *History of St. John the Evangelist's College, Cambridge*, by Tho. Baker; edited by J. E. B. Mayor, part ii. p. 987; continuation by Cole.

[2] Viscount Preston.

letters (through the almost incredible supineness of the unhappy gentleman,[1] and contrary to the assurances hee gave us) may prejudice my brethren. But you must take pains to cleare yourselves and protest your innocence. . . . Doe what you will, and whatever you think most expedient, to take off any blame from yourselves, and leave me to shift for my selfe, &c.[2]

This letter surely needs no comment; but how is it to be reconciled with the Declaration of July, in which Turner and the rest expressly affirmed that 'they never held any correspondence with France; that they were concerned in no plots, and that they should make it their practice to study to be quiet, to bear their cross patiently, and to seek the good of their native country'? For none except Turner is there any need of explanation; it was an entirely unwarranted insinuation on his part that his brethren were ready to join him, and it is not surprising that they were indignant against him for making it. But for himself? In those excited times, when events moved rapidly, it was a far cry from July to December; and there is not the slightest evidence that any plot was being hatched, or even meditated, when Turner signed the Declaration. Moreover, the object of the 'Preston Plot' (if there *was* a Preston Plot) was not the same as that indicated in the Jacobite Liturgy, which the bishops so indignantly repudiated in their Declaration in July.

The memorial drawn up by the conspirators in December distinctly disavowed the idea of making England a subject pro-

[1] Mr. Ashton.

[2] Tanner MSS., vol. xxvii. fol. 235. In reference to this letter, Sancroft writes to Lloyd: 'Shall we declare our innocence? But then nothing is proved against him ["our brother of Ely," as he calls Turner in an earlier part of the letter], and men and angels will hardly be able to prove anything against us;' and on May 18, 1691, doubtless referring to Turner, 'I am sorry that our good brother has got so high up the pinnacle. It was dangerous to fall from thence, could the informers have tript up his heels;' and on April 2, 1692, he has 'news about Fr. of Ely that makes me tremble.' See Plumptre's *Life of Ken*, ii. 71–2.

vince of France. It could not be governed as a Roman Catholic country. The French force which was to accompany James was to be only for his personal protection and that of his loving subjects, and was then to be dismissed. The king was to promise to govern according to law, to protect the established religion, to refer all points in dispute between himself and his people to a free Parliament.[1]

Admitting, however, that a conscientious man like Turner might, with a little manipulation, reconcile his conduct in the summer with his conduct in the ensuing winter, it must be confessed that his declaration that 'he should make it his practice to study to be quiet,' &c., was not exactly fulfilled in his future life. It is certain that from 1691 onwards he was in constant correspondence with the Court of St. Germains, that he was deeply involved in the Fenwick plot of 1696; in fact, that during the last ten years of his life the restoration of King James was the object he continually set before him. It was a very sad life. At first he seems to have been in less straitened circumstances than the rest; for among the Macpherson Papers is one containing proposals from King James's friends, in 1694, to the exiled monarch in which the following passage occurs: 'They desire that if your Majesty desires to call any of the Bishops [to St. Germains] it may be the Bishop of Ely. They think he would be for your service, and he is in a condition to live without being burdensome to your Majesty.' But this comparative independence did not last long; he was for the rest of his life more or less a wanderer. Now we find him in France; now at Putney; now in France again; now 'in a retired condition in the lodgings of his brother, Dr. Thomas Turner,' at Oxford; now in hiding under the name of Harris. In 1698 he is in London attending

[1] Plumptre's *Life of Ken*, ii. 84.

the funeral of Bishop White, about which he wrote a most interesting letter, which will be noticed presently; in 1699 he removed with his only daughter (so often and so prettily referred to in Bishop Ken's letters [1]) into the country; in 1700 he dies, and the restless spirit is at rest. It seems a thousand pities that the closing years of a valuable and useful life should have been spent, not to say wasted, in matters in which, as a Christian bishop, he surely had no direct concern. All that we hear of him when he was in his proper sphere as a working bishop is to his credit. He won the good opinion of people who by no means agreed with his views. Thus Rachel, Lady Russell, representing the Whig and Low Church element, writes to her spiritual adviser, Dr. Fitzwilliam (afterwards a Nonjuror): 'Lord Bedford expresses himself hugely obliged to the Bishop of Ely, your friend, to whom you justly give the title of good, if the character he very generally bears justly belongs to him.' [2] His admirable 'Letter to the Clergy of the Diocese of Ely,' 1686 in preparation for his coming visitation, gives one the impression, not only of a spiritually minded man most anxious to do his duty, but also of one who from long practical experience knew what a clergyman's duty was. In short, he was a thoroughly practical bishop, and fully maintained the high standard of efficiency in the diocese which had been bequeathed to him by his great predecessor, Bishop Gunning. Bishop Ken, his early and lifelong friend in spite of divergent views, evidently regarded him not only with the greatest personal affection, but also with deep respect, and after Turner's death always referred to him as 'that good man now with God,' [3]

[1] See Plumptre's *Life of Ken*, ii. 52–3, and *passim*.
[2] *Letters of Lady Rachel Russell*, p. 308.
[3] See Ken's Letters in Plumptre's *Life of Ken*, ii. 107, 126, and *passim*.

or 'our deare friend now with God.' Those who knew Turner best loved him most, and he bore a much higher character among his contemporaries and those of the next generation than he does in popular histories. Thus, Hawkins, the great-nephew and first biographer of Ken, writing only thirteen years after Turner's death (1713), calls him 'a most truly pious prelate';[1] Thomas Baker, who belonged only to the next generation, 'a most excellent prelate'[2]; and Dean Hickes, who knew him intimately, 'that most learned and very reverend father in Christ, Francis Turner, not so long since Bishop of Ely—ὁ Μακαρίτης—the recollection of whose friendship I, the survivor, so enjoy that I seem to have lived happily in that I have lived in the closest union with him.'[3] That he was rash and impetuous and a thoroughgoing Jacobite, who, to the dismay of his friends, was apt to commit not only himself but them, goes without saying; but if he was a traitor he was what was called in a pamphlet of the time 'a loyal traitor'; and if he had lived in quieter times he would have done better, if less exciting, work for the Church he loved. His few writings will be noticed in a later chapter.

One naturally associates the names of the two friends, Turner and Ken, together; but regarded from the point of view of this work they must be separated, for they belonged to different types of Nonjurors; and there is yet another deprived Father who was certainly of the Turner type, and must therefore come in between the friends.

Thomas White (1628–98), like Turner, had passed

[1] *Life of Ken.*

[2] 'Præsul optimus.' *History of St. John's College, Cambridge.* 'Catalogus Episcoporum qui e collegio Divi Joannis Evangelistæ prodierunt. Franciscus Turner.'

[3] 'Linguarum Veterum Septentrionalium Thesaurus' (1705), Præfatio, p. xlvi.

through a varied course of parochial experience. Having graduated at St. John's College, Cambridge, in 1646, he contrived, like several Royalists, to hold during the Protectorate the post of lecturer (at St. Andrew's, Holborn), 'the door being left so widely ajar that there was room for Rutulian as well as Trojan to enter in.'[1] After the Restoration he became successively incumbent of Newark-on-Trent (1660), Allhallows the Great, London (1666), and Bottesford in Leicestershire (1679). A story is told of him, giving a promise of pugnacity on his part, which happily was not fulfilled. He was remarkable for his physical strength and agility, and on one occasion, certainly after he was a clergyman, he was insulted by a trooper of the King's Guard, who, on being reproved by White, challenged him to a fair fight. White accepted the challenge and won the victory, and the trooper asked his pardon. Charles II. was characteristically delighted with the exploit, and jokingly threatened to impeach White for high treason for assaulting one of the King's guards. In 1683 he was made chaplain to the Princess Anne, daughter of the Duke of York, on her marriage with the Prince of Denmark. He became her favourite chaplain, and had much to do with the formation of her Church principles. In the same year he was promoted to the archdeaconry of Nottingham, and in 1685 to the bishopric of Peterborough, where he set himself to the much-needed work of remedying the abuse of pluralities. As Bishop of Peterborough he was appointed by James II. to exercise, together with Bishops Crewe and Sprat, ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the diocese of London on the

[1] Bishop Pearson's Minor Theological Works, with Memoir of the Author, by E. Churton, p. xxxi. Pearson was a London lecturer during the same period at St. Clement's, Eastcheap, and the immortal *Exposition of the Creed* contains in substance a series of lectures delivered by him there.

suspension of Bishop Compton. James, to whom White owed his rise, doubtless thought that he should find him like the other two, a convenient tool; but he soon found that White was a man of very different metal. When the infatuated monarch issued his second Declaration of Indulgence, Bishop Cartwright drew up a form of thanks to the King, and persuaded Bishops Parker and Sprat to sign it. Thinking, no doubt, that White was also a Court bishop, he requested *him* also to sign; but White asked for a day to deliberate, and then absolutely refused.[1] Consistently with this refusal he became one of the immortal Seven, and was imprisoned in the Tower. Like the majority of the Seven, who opposed the King in his prosperity, he refused to desert him in his adversity. It was expected that the influence of his patroness, the Princess Anne, would lead him to follow her example, when she abandoned her father; but those who expected this did not understand the independence of White's character. He refused the oaths to William and Mary without a moment's hesitation, and identified himself with the Nonjurors—indeed with the most advanced section of them—heart and soul. He was, of course, one of the five who issued in 1698 'The Charitable Recommendation of the Deprived Bishops,' in behalf of the relief fund started by Kettlewell for distressed Nonjurors, and had to appear before the Privy Council. But before this, in the early spring of 1693-4, he had committed himself still further, by not only taking part in the first new consecrations of Nonjuring bishops, but by allowing the ceremony to be performed in his own lodging in the house of Mr. Giffard,[2] at Southgate, in Middlesex. His

[1] See Bishop Cartwright's *Diary*, p. 47.

[2] See *infra*, p. 88 note, where a full account of this Mr. Giffard is given.

last public act showed the same courageous spirit. In 1696–7 he attended Sir John Fenwick on the scaffold—a bold thing to do, for shortly before some other Nonjurors had been brought into trouble by a somewhat similar act. Sir John refused to see any clergyman who had taken the oaths, and two or three Nonjuring clergy who were applied to naturally shrank from the dangerous task. White dared to accept it, but with characteristic independence afterwards offended some Jacobites by protesting with horror against the supposition that he had any sympathy with the plot—if plot there was—for the assassination of King William.

Bishop White appears to have been one of those men who combine an iron determination of will and a most undaunted courage with a meek and gentle nature which loves privacy and shrinks from thrusting itself to the front. Though his principles were evidently those of the more extreme Nonjurors, he never joined in any plots; he lived quite contentedly in his poverty, and practised such economy that he was able to give much out of his little to the poor; he made no enemies and many friends; he never entered into controversy, and attracted no attention except by the sweetness of his disposition. When he passed quietly away in 1698, an unpleasant incident occurred at his funeral. He was buried in the churchyard of St. Gregory's, which, the church having been destroyed, was incorporated in the precincts of St. Paul's, under the jurisdiction of the dean, but with a separate curate for the parish. This curious arrangement will account for the circumstances recorded below. The funeral was attended by forty Nonjuring clergymen, and several laymen who held the same opinions. The rest may be told in the words of Bishop

Turner, written to his brother, the President of Corpus Christi College, Oxford:

I stayed in town till yesterday that I might attend the funeral on Saturday night. It was earnestly desired by many that I should perform the office at the grave (in St. Gregory's, that is, in the churchyard, for there is no church). I yielded, if it might be permitted, which I told them would hardly be, and that my poor name would hardly pass muster. Yet the curate of the place agreed with all the ease and respect imaginable. But his *de facto* Dean, Dr. Sherlock, coming to know it, forbade it expressly, nor could any intercessions prevail with him to suffer any one of the deprived, not the most obscure or least obnoxious, to officiate. This did not hinder me nor anybody else from waiting on the corpse to the grave, the Bishop of Kilmore[1] and myself with four others holding up the pall. As soon as our bearers set down, we made our exit, and all the clergy with most of the gentry followed. The great reason alleged by Dr. Sherlock for refusing it was the daring imprudence of the Bishop of Bath and Wells (Dr. Ken) for burying Mr. Kettlewell even in his habit. Is not this a precious manikin of a Dean?[2]

Sancroft, Lloyd, Turner and White are distinguished from the other four with whom we have to do in this chapter by the doubtful recommendation of being instrumental in perpetuating the separation; and therefore it seemed necessary to treat them consecutively. Otherwise, next to Sancroft, if not before him, the bishop who might certainly claim the first place, alike for his saintliness, his ability and attainments, for the prominent part he took in Church affairs, and for the reputation he still holds among Churchmen, would be Thomas Ken.

Thomas Ken (1637–1710), Bishop of Bath and Wells, has been the subject of so many biographies, sketches,

[1] Dr. Sheridan, the only Nonjuring Irish bishop.

[2] Tanner MSS. in the Bodleian Library. A similar account is given in a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury by J. Mandeville, MS. 930, No. 22, at Lambeth Palace.

and essays,[1] that there is no need to dwell on the facts of his life. In almost every history, whether of Church or State, in England during the period when he lived, *there* will be found the name of Thomas Ken deservedly holding a high and honoured place. His character and career are just of the kind to lay hold on the imagination, and writers of almost all schools seem to find a special charm in him. But his connection with the Nonjuring question is somewhat complicated and requires elucidation.

Now there is no trait in Bishop Ken's attractive character more conspicuous than his moral courage. If, therefore, he was hesitating and vacillating in regard to the new oaths, it was not because he had not the courage of his convictions, but because he simply wished to do what was right, and was much perplexed to know what *was* the right course. The man who boldly set his face against immorality at the risk of incurring the wrath of a great Prince, which he did when chaplain at The Hague—the man who absolutely refused to allow his prebendal house at Winchester to be used as a lodging for King Charles II.'s mistress—the man who preached at the Chapel Royal itself, urging Churchmen and Dissenters to unite against the encroachments of Rome at the very time when King James II. was doing all he could to encourage those encroachments—the man who, when called to account for that sermon by the King, to whom it was reported, bravely replied, 'If your Majesty had not neglected your own duty of being present, my enemies had missed this opportunity of accusing me'—the man who was an active and prominent member of the Seven who were imprisoned in the Tower—was not the man to

[1] Biographies by Hawkins, Bowles, 'A Layman' (Anderdon), and Plumptre; sketches by Miss Strickland, Dean Luckock, Lord Macaulay, &c., &c.

be afraid of acting up to his convictions. He *was* afraid, but it was a fear of acting wrongly, whichever course he took. On the one hand, he felt keenly—and who shall blame him for feeling?—that it was a very serious thing to make anything like a schism in the Church. On the other hand, he felt quite as keenly the sanctity of the oath which he had already taken to King James, and to which this new oath was plainly contradictory. He also realised that, in common with others, though in a far more moderate degree than many, he had committed himself to the doctrine of non-resistance, and how was that doctrine consistent with the acceptance of a king who had ousted the King *de jure* with an armed force? He was also torn different ways by his nearest and dearest friends. Perhaps there were no two for whom he had more regard than Francis Turner, with whom he had been intimate from boyhood, and George Hooper, who had been, now his predecessor, now his successor, by curious alternations, in various posts, and had won Ken's esteem by his admirable management of them all. Ely House, where Turner resided, and Lambeth Rectory, the house of Hooper, had been the places where he stayed when visiting London. At the critical period when he was in doubt about the oaths he was brought more into contact with his later friend, Hooper, than with his earlier friend, Turner; and Turner was evidently nervous as to what the result might be; for he writes to Sancroft on the Ascension Day, 1689, 'This very good man [Ken] is warping from us and the true interest of the Church towards a compliance with the new Government,' and he is afraid that 'your parson of Lambeth has superfined upon our brother of Bath and Wells.'[1] The expression 'your parson' of course refers to the fact that Archbishop

[1] Plumptre, ii. 40.

Sancroft when residing at Lambeth Palace was, in a way, a parishioner of Hooper, the rector of Lambeth. Others also thought as Turner did. Dr. Fitzwilliam, of whom we shall hear more presently, 'knew him to be fluctuating,' and feared that 'the consideration of the peace of the Church' might lead him to comply.[1] Dodwell wrote a letter of remonstrance which nettled him extremely (the good man's natural temper was sharp, though subdued by grace), and called forth from him an indignant reply.[2] There were undoubtedly grounds for the Nonjurors' alarm. Turner could never 'draw' his friend 'up to the same height as himself in the matter of the oaths;'[3] and the other friend, Hooper, all but won him over. The story is very curious and very characteristic of the man. He had gone to Lambeth to consult Hooper on the matter, and

> On parting one night to go to bed, the Bishop seemed so well satisfied with the arguments Dr. Hooper urged to him, that he was inclined to take the oaths. But the next morning he used these expressions to him: 'I question not but that you and several others have taken the oaths with as good a conscience as myself shall refuse them; and sometimes you have almost persuaded me to comply by the arguments you have used; but I beg you to urge them no further; for should I be persuaded to comply, and after see reason to repent, you would make me the most miserable man in the world.' Upon which the Doctor said he would never mention the subject any more to him, for God forbid he should take them.[4]

And so Bishop Ken became a Nonjuror because he thought it was the 'safer' course; but it was 'safer' for exactly the opposite reasons to those which would weigh with less sensitively conscientious men. To speak para-

[1] *Letters of Lady Rachel Russell.*

[2] Plumptre gives the reply in full, ii. 41–2.

[3] So writes the contemporary author (or authors) of the *Life of Kettlewell*, with evident regret.

[4] Quoted by Dean Plumptre (ii. 43–4) from Prowse MS. and Hawkins.

doxically, it was *safer* because it was *more dangerous*, because it was *against*, not because it was *for*, his interest. If he took the oaths, and suspected afterwards that he had been biassed, however unconsciously, by interested motives, he would be miserable. He seems, however, to have had an uncomfortable feeling that he might be mistaken after all; but it was better to make a mistake which rendered him all but a pauper than to make one which would keep him still in affluence.

One can, however, well understand how from the very first the thoroughgoing Jacobites would regard him as a rather weak-kneed brother, and his subsequent conduct tended to strengthen that opinion. He still intimated, not obscurely, that James might yet forfeit his allegiance—if, for instance, he gave up Ireland to France, as it was suspected that he intended to do; and on James's death he would probably have complied had it not been for the ill-advised imposition of the Abjuration Oath. Unless, indeed, 'the Church point'—which, as was natural with such a man, weighed far more than 'the State point'—still barred the way. The lay deprivations were a very great shock to him as a Churchman; he still considered himself as the canonical Bishop of Bath and Wells; he publicly protested from the pulpit of Wells Cathedral against his uncanonical deprivation; he professed himself still ready to perform his episcopal functions for all who were ready to accept them; he made a point of continuing to sign himself 'Thos. Bath and Wells,' though another Bishop of Bath and Wells was appointed. He was the more ready to do all this when he found that the intending bishop was one whom he characterised, rather too severely, as 'a Latitudinarian traditor' who would not keep the *depositum* safe.

But he does not seem to have been comfortable in his

strange position; he regarded it as a cross to be endured, and a cross much harder to bear than the loss of his worldly wealth and rank, which he counted as naught. It will, perhaps, be a shock to some readers, as it certainly was to the writer when he was reluctantly convinced of the fact, to learn that in the oft-quoted passage in Bishop Ken's will, in which he declares that he 'dies in the Communion of the Church of England, as it stands distinguished from all Popish and Puritan Innovations, and as it adheres to the Doctrine of the Cross,' the Doctrine of the Cross does not mean the Doctrine of the Atonement, but the Doctrine of Passive Obedience; in fact, just what Ken's friend Kettlewell meant by it.[1]

Ken, like many Nonjurors, accepted, in a way, Queen Anne as his sovereign; he declined, indeed, the offer which she made to restore him to his beloved see in 1703–4, but that was on the ground of age and infirmities. He gratefully accepted from her a slight addition to his very modest income,[2] and he was more than ready to recognise as bishop one who was a younger and, as he in his humility thought, a better man than himself. So he at once, and gladly, ceded to Hooper all his rights, and henceforth signed himself simply 'T. K.' He fondly hoped that this would tend to close the separation—a consummation for which he had long devoutly prayed. He had deeply regretted the new consecrations, though he reluctantly gave his assent to them. He never joined in any Jacobite plots. He consorted as intimately with

[1] See *Christianity a Doctrine of the Cross*; Kettlewell's *Compleat Works*, vol. ii., esp. pp. 143–4. Also i. 167, where the writer, who knew Ken personally, says expressly: 'The "Doctrine of the Cross" in Bishop Kenn's will is equivalent to asserting the Doctrine of Passive Obedience as the proper Characteristic of the Church of England. . . . Neither can there be any manner of doubt that it was approved of by him in the same sense as Mr. Kettlewell wrote it in.'

[2] See Plumptre, ii. 149.

Jurors as Nonjurors. He did not, like many, consider the Established Church in a state of schism; he encouraged 'private persons' to attend its services, though as 'a public person' he himself could not join in services where the 'characteristics' (that is, where the reigning sovereigns were prayed for by name) were used. There was, therefore, nothing really inconsistent either with his principles or his past conduct in the cession of his see to Hooper; but Bishop Lloyd—who was, in a sense, head of the Nonjurors—seems to me to have had some reason to complain that he made it without consulting his fellow-sufferers; and in the painful little controversy which ensued the fault was surely not, as is commonly supposed, altogether on the side of Bishop Lloyd. Quite enough, however, has been said about this temporary misunderstanding.[1] Any faults there may have been on Ken's side were but as spots in the sun. Most deservedly has his character, with its happy mixture of gentleness and firmness, of tenderness and boldness, been admired on all sides. There is hardly a discordant note in the chorus of praise in which he has been celebrated by posterity.

But it was not so with all his contemporaries. Ken was very far from incurring the woe pronounced against those of whom all men speak well. Bishop Burnet, being a partisan of quite a different school both in theology and politics, naturally writes in a depreciatory tone about him. He was an object of great abuse among those Jacobites who thought he had deserted his friends by recognising 'a schismatic' as his successor. 'The Jacobites,' he writes, 'at Bristoll, fomented by those at London, are thoroughly enraged against me for my cession to one whom all mankind besides themselves have

[1] See *supra*, pp. 44–5.

a high esteem of;'[1] and, again: 'The ferment against me rises higher and higher, insomuch that when the neighbours at Bristol come hither'—that is to Naish Court, the home of the Misses Kemeys, where he was staying—'they manifestly insult me.'[2]

But it takes two parties to make a quarrel, and one of the parties Ken resolutely refused to be. He was naturally sharp tempered, and, when he was attacked, vindicated himself with vigour—sometimes with a little asperity; but having done so, *there* he let the matter drop, and nothing could induce him to resume it; and sometimes when the heat had passed away he would cry 'peccavi'—as in the case of Dodwell and of Lloyd—in a way which necessarily disarmed all further criticism. Controversy he abhorred, and it has been truly remarked that 'there is nowhere to be found any one controversial tract by Bishop Ken; he preached boldly, especially when King James's designs became more apparent, but his peaceful spirit was unfitted for the strife of controversy.'[3]

The fact is, Ken was just the reverse of some men who only seem to come to the front when a quarrel arises; Ken, on the contrary, was always in evidence when some plain, practical good was to be done; never, if he could avoid it, when internal disputes arose among Christians. Was there need of Christian intercession in behalf of sufferers cruelly treated, as in the case of those who were used so barbarously after the suppression of the Monmouth rebellion? *There* was Ken ready to rush, as it were, into the lion's mouth, and to intercede for them, not ineffectually, with their infuriated and powerful

[1] Letter 'To Mrs. Hannah Lloyd' (that is, Bishop Lloyd). See Plumptre, ii. 141.

[2] *Ibid.* ii. 146.

[3] *Life of T. Ken*, by 'A Layman,' 2nd edit., p. 254.

oppressors. Was there a careless, godless King to be admonished, in sickness or in health, living or dying, of his faults? *There* was Ken ready to admonish him faithfully, without fear or favour. Was there an infatuated King rushing to his own destruction? *There* was Ken ready to stop him, if possible, in his headlong course. Was there a libertine, friend of a powerful prince, to be urged to do justice to a poor girl whom he had ruined? *There* was Ken ready to undertake the thankless task, and carrying it out successfully, though with the loss of the prince's favour. Was there a poor man condemned to death for actions of which Ken utterly disapproved? Still, *there* he was, to comfort him and pray with him in his dying hours. Was there urgent need of the aid of the charitable to stave off starvation from sufferers for conscience' sake? *There* was Ken in the forefront of the effort, and ready to justify boldly the course which he had taken. The kind of work, in which the broad principles of Christian faith and charity were at stake, he loved to take part in. No one better than he could play the part of a St. John the Baptist, and, 'after his example, constantly speak the truth, boldly rebuke vice, and patiently suffer for the truth's sake.' But to contend about disputable points was not in accordance with his nature. There was certainly no lack of disputants on such points in the times of the Nonjurors; and it is refreshing, if only for the sake of variety, to find one who shrank from joining their ranks, but who never shrank from plain, practical, Christian work, however difficult, thankless, or dangerous it might be; and such a one was the saintly Thomas Ken. He will meet us again in other connections; but considering how well he is known, even to the most superficial readers of Church history, enough has been said of him in his capacity

as one of the deprived Fathers; and we may now turn to

Robert Frampton (1622–1708), who was a Nonjuror of the type of Ken, but does not, like Ken, appear to have had any hesitation whatever about declining the oaths. Like Ken, he continued, in spite of his deprivation, to regard himself as canonical Bishop of Gloucester, and was ready to perform his episcopal functions whenever required; and, as Dean Plumptre frequently reminds us, he was of all others the prelate most after Ken's own heart, though, of course, not so intimate with him as Turner was. But he was fifteen years older than Ken, and this may in part account for the far less active part he took in public affairs after the Revolution. Another reason, indeed, has been given, and that on very high authority. 'Some,' writes the contemporary biographer of Kettlewell, 'thought he [Frampton] had too low an opinion of himself; and was, therefore, not bold and active enough. He was sensible that he wanted courage, but commended it in Ken and others,' with more to the same effect.[1] Now it may seem presumptuous to disagree with the judgment of contemporaries who were in the thick of the fight, and who ought to know better than a writer two hundred years later. But facts are facts; and the known facts of Frampton's life are certainly incompatible with the theory that he was a timid man, who had not the courage of his opinions. Moreover, we must balance one contemporary against another; and, through the enterprise of Mr. T. Simpson Evans, we happily have an anonymous biography written by 'an intimate friend of the Bishop' who was 'in attendance on him during his last illness and at his death,' and who wrote the memoir only a few years after that death, 'on purpose,'

[1] See Life of Kettlewell, prefixed to his *Compleat Works*, i. 157.

he says, 'to keep his glorious character fresh in my mind, when, by age or oppression, other things may wear out.'[1] It may be objected that an admiring biographer must be taken *cum grano*; but one who wrote so near the time could hardly be mistaken about, or safely misrepresent, plain facts; and the facts are these.

Robert Frampton was old enough at the time of the Great Rebellion to be obliged to take a decided line, and he *did* take a very decided one. He left Oxford without his M.A. degree, because he could not take it unless he signed the Covenant, which he refused. After having for a short time earned his living by tuition, we find him fighting on the Royalist side at 'the engagement of Hambleton [Halidown?] Hill.' Then he received Holy Orders from Skinner, deprived Bishop of Oxford, at the instance of the well-known Dr. Davenant. His first sermon was a courageous defence of the Royal authority at a time when it was highly dangerous to utter such sentiments. He boldly adhered to the Liturgy in opposition to the Directory; and when his father died, and the officiating minister refused to bury him with the Church Service, undertook the office himself and performed it in a flood of tears.[2] Becoming a noted preacher, he was frequently called upon to preach in London; and he was so outspoken that he would have fallen into trouble had he not been appointed chaplain to the factory of the Turkey Company at Aleppo, whither he set off in 1655. But there was some delay about his departure, and during the interval he continued preaching against the errors of

[1] See the interesting and modest Preface of Mr. Simpson Evans to *The Life of Robert Frampton, Bishop of Gloucester, Deprived as a Nonjuror* 1689, which 'is an exact reproduction of the manuscript Memoir of Robert Frampton,' p. viii.

[2] *Life*, p. 12.

the times, until Mr. Harvey, to whom he owed his appointment, remonstrated with him, saying, 'What do you intend to do? To bring yourself and your friends into trouble? You'l be preaching about until you'l be hanged for an application. Your ship is ready, repair to that; then you may safely discharge your office.' [1] He ministered at Aleppo for twelve years, making friends not only with Christians of all sorts, but also with Mussulmans. He returned to England in 1667, but, hearing that the plague had broken out at Aleppo with great virulence, he returned thither and fearlessly ministered to the sufferers, not returning finally to England until 1670. In 1673 he was preferred to the deanery, and in 1680 to the bishopric, of Gloucester. All through his public life he showed the same courage that Ken showed, not scrupling to offend Charles II. by preaching against the atheism and irreligion that prevailed at Court, nor James II. by lifting up his testimony frequently against Romanism; and, as he was one of the most popular and effective preachers of the day,[2] his words carried weight. The living of Slimbridge, in his diocese, was, and still is, in the gift of Magdalen College, Oxford, and he absolutely refused to institute to it the nominee of the Roman Catholic president, thrust upon the College by James II. It was only through the impossibility of reaching London in time (he was too late by half an hour) that he was not one of the bishops imprisoned in the Tower; and he so entirely identified himself with their cause that he desired to present to the King a private petition to the same effect as theirs, and was only dissuaded from doing so by the opinion of Sancroft, his Metropolitan. He not only refused to

[1] *Life*, p. 26.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 152. See Pepys's *Diary*, *passim*, for an account of Frampton's early preaching.

obey the King's order to direct his clergy to read the Declaration of Indulgence, but actually forbade them to do so.

These acts were not the acts of a timid man; and if he kept in the background after the Revolution it is not difficult to see his reasons. He was verging on seventy when the deprivation actually took place, and was eighty-six when he died. The other two who survived the rest (Ken and Lloyd) were much younger men, and there is no more characteristic symptom of declining years than a tendency *quieta non movere*. 'Dr. Frampton, Bishop of Gloucester,' writes Hickes, in reference to the new consecrations, 'absolutely refused all correspondence with his brethren, from which he desired to be excused, alleging that he had retired from all business, but what related to his soul, in preparing himself for death.'[1] But there was another reason—Frampton never was a Nonjuror of the type of Hickes. So far from regarding the Established Church as in a state of schism, he held, as far as he possibly could, communion with it. He retained, with the connivance of the Government, the poor living of Standish (the net income was only 40*l*. a year) which he had held *in commendam* with his bishopric, officiating in its parish church, as far as his conscience would allow, and leaving his curates, who had presumably taken the oaths, to do what he could not. He preached from his pew, catechised the children, and even said the prayers, omitting, of course, the 'characteristics.' He was not, in any active sense of the term, a Jacobite; and was extremely annoyed at Bishop Turner's letter to the English King in France, which committed all the Nonjuring prelates to James's interest. But in spite of this he did not escape the charge of favouring popery, and

[1] Hickes's Introduction to *The Records of the New Consecrations*.

was, in fact, arrested and imprisoned on the absurd suspicion of being concerned in a plot to assassinate King William; but it was soon found that he was only concerned in the fund for the relief of the distressed clergy, and he was speedily released. He remained on excellent terms with several of the complying bishops; we hear of friendly interviews between him and Bishops Tenison and Lloyd (of St. Asaph), while Bishop Compton, of London, was his firm and constant friend to the last. In fact, he was so favourable to the 'Revolution Church' that Dodwell (himself a very moderate Nonjuror) wrote him a wrathful expostulation on the course he was taking; and Bishop Lloyd had hopes of inducing him to comply. But Lloyd was quite mistaken in his man. Bishop Frampton was firm in his principles and knew what he meant. The oaths he never intended to take; and when Queen Anne offered to make him Bishop of Hereford, an offer which he was urgently importuned to accept, he replied that 'he could not hold two, for that the care of one he had found enough, and that he, if he must have any, had rather have his own than any, but, says he, "I can take no new one any more than hold the old one, and that which put me out when in will keep me out when out."'[1] Holding this view, it may seem strange that he could be so friendly with those who were not 'put out.' But, as his biographer intimates,[2] his experience in the East had tended to widen his sympathies; for, having consorted there with men of all sorts of opinions, he was prepared to think more lightly than other Nonjurors of differences between men who after all meant to be English Churchmen.

The two remaining bishops were 'Confessors in will, but not in deed,' being called to their rest before the

[1] *Life*, p. 224. [2] *Ibid.* p. 207.

sentence of deprivation came into execution; but their trumpet gave no uncertain sound, and they rank virtually among the deprived Fathers.

Of *William Thomas* (1613–89), Bishop of Worcester, we have happily a full account, written by a descendant for Nash's 'Collection for the History of Worcestershire;' and what we learn from other sources shows that this was not merely the partial account of a relative. He was a Welshman by extraction, but was born at Bristol; on the early death of his father he was brought up by his grandfather at Carmarthen, and was educated at the Grammar School in that place up to the time of his going to Oxford, where he became fellow and tutor of Jesus College. Like Frampton, who was born in the same year, he was thus old enough to show his colours at the time of the Rebellion, and he took the same line that Frampton did. He had received Holy Orders, and been presented to the living of Laugharne, in Carmarthenshire. But in order to keep this (and perhaps other) preferments during the troubles he would have been obliged to take the Covenant. This he refused to do, and was consequently ejected. Like Frampton, he earned his livelihood by tuition until the Restoration, when he was reinstated in his living. In 1661 he was presented to the rectory of Lampeter-Velfrey,[1] in Pembrokeshire, by Lord Chancellor Hyde, and made chaplain to the Duke of York, who henceforth became his steady patron, and it was evidently a great grief to Thomas to be obliged by conscience to oppose him. In 1665 he was promoted, again through the influence of the duke and the chancellor, to the deanery of Worcester, in which capacity he won the esteem of the county gentry, especially Sir John Pakington, who,

[1] 'Llanbeder in the Valley' (Nash).

that he might enjoy more of his company, presented him to the rectory of Hampton in 1670. He quitted Langharne and removed his family to Hampton; here he enjoyed an easy and pleasant retirement, and was often heard to say that this was the pleasantest part of his life, and that here he had more quiet and satisfaction within himself than when he was afterwards in the highest order of the Church; here he found time to search into antiquity, and enlarge his mind, and enrich it with fruitful knowledge,[1]

the deanery apparently not weighing very heavily upon him. In 1677 he became Bishop of St. Davids, holding, as was frequently the evil custom of the time, the deanery of Worcester *in commendam*. This was a happy appointment, for he was a Welshman himself, and, unlike most Welsh bishops of the period, 'thoroughly identified himself with the interests of his diocese.'[2] He was 'very acceptable to the gentry and clergy of the diocese; he had been bred among them, spake their language, and been a fellow-sufferer with many of them in the late troublesome times; . . . . he preached frequently in several parts of the diocese in the language of the country, and was very instrumental in promoting the translation of the Bible into Welsh.'[3] In 1683 he was translated to Worcester, where he was hospitable to the rich and charitable to the poor, almost to lavishness, and to the impoverishment of his own family. When the Seven Bishops were sent to the Tower,

> This was a great grief to our Bishop, not that he was concerned for any fault or misbehaviour in his brethren, or for the calamity that had befallen them, for he often wished that he had been with them, to bear his testimony for so good a cause, and to have a share with them in their honourable sufferings, but he was troubled to think on that impending storm which he foresaw might fall upon the Church.[4]

[1] *Life* (Nash). [2] Bevan's *Diocesan History of St. Davids*, p. 196.
[3] Nash, *ut supra*. [4] *Ibid.*

This is borne out by an interesting letter, dated 'Worcester, June 3, 1688,' and written by Thomas, apparently to Sancroft's chaplain. It runs:

Worthy Sir,—I pray present my dutifully devoted observance to my Lord's Grace of Canterbury. I pray God direct and prosper his steerage of the Church of England in these tempestuous times. In a cordial compliance with his Grace's pious conduct in the late Petition presented to the King I have retained in my custody the pacquet of the printed copyes of the Royal Declaration of Indulgence which I could not transmit to the clergy of my diocese committed to my pastoral charge (*salvâ conscientiâ, salvo honore Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*). It is a piercing, wounding affliction to me to incur his Majesty's displeasure, to be misinterpreted guilty of the least degree of disloyalty or ingratitude (which my soul abhorrs) towards my inexpressibly obliging master and benefactor, patron and soveraigne, whose special mandate I have received in the concerne of the Indulgence imparted to me by the Lord Bishop of St. David's; wherein nothing could divert or slacken my intire submission and utmost conformity, but my dread of the indignation of the King of Kings, to whom, being neare the brinke of the grave, I must shortly give an account of my managing of the Episcopal station (wherein God be merciful to me), I apprehend it a duty incumbent on me, indispensibly strict, to be a skreene to my clergy, to endeavour to secure them from sinnes and perils, not to lay traines for either, by recommending the publication of that to their parishioners wherein my own judgment is abundantly dissatisfy'd and theirs also. I resolve by God's gracious assistance to suffer the greatest temporal evil of distresse rather than teach or promote the least spiritual evil of guilt.[1]

This letter prepares us for the course which Bishop Thomas took at the Revolution. It was hard enough work for him to *disobey* the King to whom he owed so much, and there is evidently a personal feeling that he might appear ungrateful; to *renounce* that king, and swear allegiance to another, was what he could never dream of doing. 'If my heart,' he said, 'do not deceive me, and

[1] Gutch's *Collectanea Curiosa*, i. 332.

God's grace do not fail me, I think I could suffer at a stake rather than take this oath.' If there had been any doubt in his mind (which there was not), there was one at hand ready to dispel it. The bishop and the dean, William Thomas and George Hickes, stood shoulder to shoulder in the crisis, and Hickes took the bishop's dying declaration of unshaken loyalty, made only three days before his death. The two are said to have 'stood almost alone in their refusal in that diocese.'[1] There were at least twelve others, but this is a small number considering the example set by the two highest dignitaries. The dean had a very high opinion of his bishop, and calls him 'that excellent bishop worthy of everlasting memory.'[2] The end came rather suddenly at last, on June 25, 1689. The bishop evidently did not expect it quite so soon, for 'he prepared himself for leaving his palace and vacating his see, and agreed with Mr. Martin, Vicar of Wormley, to come and live with him, and wrote to Stillingfleet, telling he would use all his interest that he might succeed him.'[3] But he also made full preparations for the other alternative.

According to his own appointment he was buried in the Cloisters, being used to say that the church was for the living, and not for the dead; his funeral was ordered by himself, as many old men going before his corpse cloath'd in black as he was years old. He ordered this inscription: 'Depositum Gulielmi Thomas, S.T.P., olim Decani Wigorniensis indigni, postea Episcopi Menevensis indignioris, tandem Episcopi

[1] Lathbury's *History of the Nonjurors*, p. 52, quoted from Kettlewell's *Life*, 85.

[2] Preface to the *Collection of Dean Hickes's Letters*, vol. i.

[3] Nash, *ut supra*. This reference to Stillingfleet, who, of course, did succeed him, shows that, had Thomas lived, he would probably have been a Nonjuror of the type of Ken, not of his friend and coadjutor, Hickes; and other circumstances of his life point to the same conclusion—*e.g.* his interest in and munificence to the French Protestants.

Wigorniensis indignissimi, meritis tamen Christi resurrectionis ad vitam æternam candidati.'

But on the marble monument erected to his memory in the cathedral, Dean Hickes added :

Sanctissimus et doctissimus Præsul, pietatis erga Deum, erga Regem fidelitatis, charitatis erga Proximos illustre exemplum expiravit An. Redemptionis MDCLXXXIX. Ætatis, LXXVI. Junii XXV. et moribundus hoc quicquid est epitaphi pro modestia sua tumulo inscribi jussit.

The last of the prelates to be noticed in this chapter is *John Lake* (1624–89), Bishop of Chichester, the chief characteristic of whom, all his life through, was a most undaunted courage, both moral and physical. 'I thank God,' he once said, 'I never knew what fear was, when I was once satisfied of the goodness of my cause,' and he never did. He was a Yorkshireman by birth and education, being born at Halifax and educated there until his admission at St. John's College, Cambridge, at what was even then the early age of thirteen. When he had taken his B.A. degree, while he was still a mere lad, 'his college being made a prison for the royal party, he was kept a prisoner there,' refusing, as a Royalist, to take the Covenant. He managed, however, to make his escape, and fled from Cambridge to Oxford, then the head-quarters of the Royalists. He joined the King's army as a volunteer, and served in it for four years with conspicuous bravery, especially at the defence of Basing House and at Wallingford Castle, which was one of the last garrisons that held out for King Charles I. His military instincts adhered to him through life, and sometimes served him in good stead. In 1647 he received Holy Orders, probably from Skinner, the ejected Bishop of Oxford, and preached his first sermon at his native place, Halifax. With characteristic courage and decisive-

ness he refused the 'Engagement,' which several excellent Churchmen took,[1] and had to flee from Halifax to Oldham, where for a year or two he contrived to exercise his ministry. We then lose sight of him until the Restoration, when he was presented to the vicarage of Leeds; but the Puritans were so opposed to the appointment that at his induction soldiers had to be called in to keep the peace--a not inappropriate incident, considering that it was a soldier-priest who was being inducted. In 1663 he was collated by the Bishop of London (Dr. Gilbert Sheldon) to the living of St. Botolph's, Bishopsgate; and in 1667 was also made Prebendary of Holborn, in St. Paul's Cathedral; in this capacity he formed an intimate friendship with Sancroft, then Dean of St. Paul's. In 1669 he was appointed to the living of Prestwich, in Lancashire, and in 1671 to the prebend of Fridaythorpe, in York Minster; and in 1680 was installed Archdeacon of Cleveland. His connection with York Minster brought out, but in a very proper way, his warlike propensities. There was a bad custom of people lounging about in the nave of the minster while divine service was going on in the choir; this kindled the wrath of the intrepid prebendary, who went into the nave and pulled off the hats of all who were wearing them. A still worse custom was that of the city apprentices holding a revel in the cathedral on Shrove Tuesday. Lake's determined opposition to this raised a riot; but he defied the rabble, declaring that he had faced death in the field too often to dread martyrdom. He was advised to retire to his country living, but he manfully stayed at his post until he succeeded in putting a stop to the desecration of the minster. In 1682 he was nominated by the Earl of Derby to the bishopric of Sodor and Man, and 'sacrificed

[1] *E.g.* Robert Sanderson.

a rich prebend for a poor bishopric;' and in 1684, through the influence of Bishop Turner with the Duke of York, was translated to Bristol.[1] Here again his military experience stood him in stead. The Monmouth Rebellion, the scene of which was the West of England, naturally disturbed Bristol; and its gallant bishop hastened from London, where he was attending to Parliamentary duties, to keep order in his cathedral city. This greatly pleased King James, and led (through the instrumentality of Sancroft) to Lake's final promotion to the bishopric of Chichester in 1685. He was a most active and popular bishop in that diocese, was one of the Seven who were imprisoned in the Tower, and one of the Eight who refused the oaths of allegiance to William and Mary. Strong influence was used to induce him to take the oaths, but he persistently refused, and on being told that, if he persisted, his suspension would take place on August 1, and his deprivation on the following February 1, he replied in words which have become almost classical, that 'He considered that the day of *death* and of *judgment* are as certain as the 1st of *August* and the 1st of *February*, and acted accordingly.' 'The day of death' was very near at hand. On August 27, 1689, feeling that the end was approaching, he dictated to his chaplain, Robert Jenkin, whom he had lately collated to the precentorship of the cathedral, and who afterwards became master of his own college, St. John's, Cambridge, the following remarkable 'Profession':

> Being called by a sick and I think a dying bed, and the good hand of God upon me in it, to take the last and best *viaticum*, the sacrament of my dear Lord's body and blood, I take myself obliged to make this short recognition and profession.
>
> That whereas I was baptized into the religion of the Church

[1] *Defence of Bishop Lake's Profession*, by R. Jenkin, p. 9.

of England, and sucked it in with my milk, I have constantly adhered to it through the whole course of my life, and now, if it be the will of God, shall dye in it; and I had resolved, through God's grace assisting me, to have dyed so, though at a stake.

And whereas that religion of the Church of England taught me the doctrine of non-resistance and passive obedience, which I have accordingly inculcated upon others, and which I took to be the distinguishing character of the Church of England, I adhere no less firmly and steadfastly to that, and in consequence of it have incurred a suspension from the exercise of my office and expected a deprivation. I find in so doing much inward satisfaction, and if the Oath had been tendered at the peril of my life, I could only have obeyed by suffering.

I desire you, my worthy friends and brethren, to bear witness of this upon occasion, and to believe it as the words of a dying man, and who is now engaged in the most sacred and solemn act of conversing with God in this world, and may, for ought he knows to the contrary, appear with these very words in his mouth at the dreadful tribunal. 'Manu propria subscripsi.'

JOHANNES CICESTRENSIS.

When the Communion was over [Dr. Jenkin goes on to tell us] he called to Mr. Powell, his Secretary, and ordered him to make an Act of it [the Profession]. The Lord Bishop of Norwich [1] coming to visit him soon after, his Lordship pray'd him to look over the Paper, and then desired the Dean of Worcester [2] to carry it with him to Lambeth, and discoursed of it to my Lord Bishop of Ely,[3] who that evening made him a visit; so that nothing, perhaps, in all its circumstances was ever more solemnly and deliberately done.[4]

Within three days (August 30, 1689) Bishop Lake was called to his rest; and on September 3 was buried in his old church, St. Botolph's, Bishopsgate.

[1] Dr. Lloyd. [2] Dr. Hickes. [3] Dr. Turner.

[4] 'A Defense of the Profession which the Right Reverend Father in God, John, late Lord Bishop of Chichester, made upon his Death-bed concerning Passive Obedience and the New Oaths; together with an Account of some Passages in his Lordship's Life,' 1690.

Dr. Jenkin adds this very pertinent postscript to the 'Defense':

> It is very observable that the only two Bishops who have dyed since the refusal of the Oath, have declared, when they had now done with this world, and had no other expectations but of death and judgment, they refused it only upon a principle of Conscience. And all who have any conscience or charity themselves, or the least respect for the Church of England, must give great regard to the dying words of two such Bishops, in whom their worst enemies can find nothing to blame, but that which shall be to their eternal honour, that all the temptations and inducements, which probably can happen in any case, could never prevail with them to take an oath against their consciences.

Enough has now been said about the deprived Fathers individually. One general remark may be added in conclusion. The estimation in which they were deservedly held arose rather from their moral than from their intellectual qualities. They lived in times when there were intellectual giants in the land; but though none of them were deficient, none of them attained to the gigantic stature of the great Caroline divines, such as Barrow, South, Bramhall, Jeremy Taylor, Sanderson, Cosin, Hammond, and Thorndike. The one who approached nearest the standard was perhaps Bishop Ken. On this point Lord Macaulay says truly, 'Ken both in intellectual and moral qualities ranked highest among the Nonjuring prelates;'[1] but even Ken, to judge by his literary achievements, was not the equal of the earlier divines intellectually. Neither can he, and still less can any of the rest, bear comparison in this regard with many of the other Nonjurors who will come before us—such, for instance, as Hickes, Leslie, Collier, Brett, Spinckes, Law, Dodwell, Baker, and many besides. But the moral

[1] *History of England*, ch. xiv. (vol. ii. p. 103, in the edition in 2 vols., published 1873).

courage of the deprived Fathers as leaders of the van, their self-sacrifice, their quiet demeanour (*exceptis excipiendis*) under very trying circumstances, their blameless and exemplary lives compelled admiration. Justice, but not more than justice, has been done to *them* by posterity. Whether equal justice has been done to those who certainly followed their lead remains to be seen.

CHAPTER III

BISHOPS OF THE NEW CONSECRATION

It was a most serious step which the deprived bishops took when they determined to consecrate others to take their places when they were gone. The reasons which seem to have weighed with them have been noticed in the opening chapter, and we have now to consider the results of their action. The measures which were adopted have been described in the fullest detail and the most vivid manner by one who was very nearly concerned; and, as it would be impossible to improve upon this description, it shall here be inserted at length. It is Dr. Hickes's introduction to 'The Records of the New Consecrations,' and we probably owe its preservation, as we owe so much valuable information concerning the Nonjurors, to Dr. Richard Rawlinson.[1] It runs thus:

After the deprivation of the Archbishop of Canterbury and his brethren, on the first of February, 1689 [*sic*], they began to think of continuing their succession by new consecrations, and often discoursed of it; but without taking any particular resolution till after the consecrations of the intruders into their sees; which happened on Whit Sunday, 31 of May, 1691. Then the deprived Archbishop and Bishops in and about London resolved to continue their succession, and in order thereunto to write to

[1] Personally, my thanks are due to the Rev. J. L. Fish, rector of St. Margaret Pattens, who also showed me an original copy of the *Record of the New Consecrations*, at Sion College, and another belonging to Kenneth Gibbs, Esq. Thirty copies of the *Record* &c. were distributed by Dr. Rawlinson, who had them privately printed. He gave a bound copy to the Bodleian Library, where it still is.

the king about it. In their discourses on this matter the Bishop of Ely acquainted the Archbishop and his brethren that there were some letters in the library of St. John's College in Cambridge, which had passed between Sir Edward Hyde, afterwards Earl of Clarendon and Lord Chancellor, and Dr. Barwick, afterwards Dean of St. Paul's not long before the Restauration, concerning the continuation of the succession of the bishops of the Church of England, then reduced to about seven. This obliged them to write to Mr. B——,[1] fellow of St. John's College, to desire him to send up these letters; which accordingly were sent. It brought them also a resolution to impart the secret to my lord Clarendon, who had been his father's secretary in the correspondence with Dr. Barwick. It appears from these letters, which were but part of what passed on the occasion, or from the information of my lord Clarendon, or from both, that difficulties arose at that time about the manner of continuing the succession of bishops; because either there wanted *deans and chapters*, to whom the *congé d'élire* with a letter missive should be sent, or because the *deans* and *prebendaries* of any church, then surviving in a sufficient number, could not legally hold chapters out of their respective churches. On this account it was thought the best way, because the only way practicable, to ordain Suffragan Bishops according to the statute of Henry VIII. But soon after this resolution was taken the king was called home by an unforeseen providence, which prevented the execution.

Upon this information the *archbishop* and *bishops* resolved upon the same method for the continuation of their succession, because though there were legal *deans and chapters* in most churches, yet they were not such to whom his majesty could direct his *Congés d'Elire*, or who would have received them. On this resolution the deprived *archbishop* and bishops determined to write to the King to desire his Majesty's consent in the way directed by the statute, for consecrating new *bishops*. My lord Clarendon was accordingly desired to write to my lord Melfort, the King's secretary, about this affair; which he did, and soon received from him his majestie's most gracious answer to this purpose: that he was well pleased with the design, and would readily concur with it. After the receipt of this answer my

[1] Probably Hilkiah Bedford, who published a translation of the Latin *Life of John Barwick* by Peter Barwick.

lord Clarendon wrote him a second letter by the dictation of the archbishop and bishops in pursuance of the same design according to the statute aforesaid. But to this no answer was returned for a long time. This gave occasion to suspect that his majestie had been persuaded from consenting to the continuation of the succession of our bishops by such as desired nothing more than to see it interrupted. Which made the good fathers resolve rather to do this important matter without his majestie's consent than not at all. However, they determined to renew their application to the King, but whether before they had sent a third letter or after it, I cannot well remember, they received an answer from my lord Melfort signifying his *majestie's* great desire to have the new consecrations finished, and requiring them in order thereunto, to send some person over, with whom his majestie could confer about this matter, and send a list of the *deprived clergy* by him. The person of whom they made choice [Dr. Hickes] set out from London, May the nineteenth, 1693, and went by way of Holland; which by reason of many difficulties and disappointments made it six weekes ere he arrived at St. Germains. He came thither at night as his majesty was concluding his supper, after which he kissed his hand; and having received his majestie's directions, whom only he should see there, he was conducted to a lodging prepared for him. Next night at the same hour he was sent for to the King, who in the first place was pleased to make an apology for having so long delayed his answer to my lord Clarendon's second letter, above-mentioned—viz. that before he proceeded further in this matter, he thought himself obliged fully to satisfy his own conscience, as to the lawfulness of his own part in it; which, said he, I did first by consulting of those I thought the best casuists of the place where I am—viz. the archbishop of Paris and the bishop of Meaux, and *they* by laying the case before the Pope. The resolution of the two bishops, says he, I have here; and they both agree in this determination though consulted separately: that the Church of England being established by the laws of the Kingdom, I am under no obligation of conscience to act against it, but obliged to maintain and defend it, as long as these laws are in force. And then his majesty put the papers containing the said case and those bishops' resolution of it into the doctor's hands, desiring him to read them; which he did, and found them as his majesty represented. His majesty said he had not yet received the pope's

answer, but did not doubt he should before the doctor returned, which accordingly happened; and the doctor saw it before his departure: and it was to the same effect with that of the two bishops. The King shewed these three determinations to my lord Fanshaw, about two years after who went over about some business, and after his return assured the doctor that he had both seen and read them. After the doctor had that night read the said two papers, the King proceeded to tell him that his majesty had on all occasions 'justified the Church of England, since the Revolution, declaring that the true Church of England remained in that part of the clergy and people, which adhered to her doctrines and suffered for them: and that, Sir,' said he, 'is the Church of England which I will maintain and defend, and the succession of whose bishops I desire may be continued, and when it shall please God to restore me or mine, we may meet with such a Church of England, and such bishops: and I desire for that end that the new consecrations may be made as soon as conveniently they can after your return.' At that and other audiences his majesty expressed his esteem of the deprived bishops and clergy, and of the laity that suffered with them, in the most tender and affectionate manner even with tears in his eyes, and he declared that he was very sensible that the greatest part of the complying clergy still loved him, and had fallen only through their infirmity, and very few through disaffection and malice to him.

The doctor had his 'congé' of his majesty the latter end of July and arrived at Rotterdam on the seventh of August, where he waited all that month and the next to return in a fleet of merchants under the convoy of the same men of war that convoyed the yatcht [*sic*] in which the prince of Orange returned, but when he should have gone on board, he was seized with an ague and fever which detained him near four months longer, viz.: till January the twenty-fourth on which day he went from Rotterdam, and going on board the packet boat on the twenty-sixth arrived at Harwich on the twenty-ninth. Where he escaped being examined by one Mackay a Scotchman placed there to examine passengers, by sitting next to a foreign minister in the boat which brought the passengers on shore. After three days stay at Harwich he came to London on the fourth of February and on the feast of S. Matthias the twenty-fourth of the same month the consecrations were solemnly performed according to the rites of the Church of England by Dr. William

Lloyd, Bishop of Norwich, Dr. Francis Turner, Bishop of Ely, and Dr. Thomas White, bishop of Peterborough, at the bishop of Peterborough's lodgings, at the Rev. Mr. William Giffard's house[1] at Southgate in Middlesex: Dr. Kenn, bishop of Bath and Wells giving his consent. Here it is to be noted that Dr. Frampton, bishop of Gloucester absolutely refused all correspondence with his brethren, alleging that he had retired from all business, but what related to his soul, in preparing himself for death; and that Dr. William Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury dyed while the doctor lay ill at Rotterdam, but he joined in everything relating hereto, while he lived, and particularly recommended to the King one of the two persons to be consecrated, as the bishop of Norwich did the other. All the time of his Grace's retirement in Suffolk he corresponded with the bishop of Norwich notwithstanding that he had given him a deputation in due form in the Latin tongue, impowering him to act in all cases relating to Church affairs in his stead which yet the bishop seldom made use of, without first acquainting him with it, and receiving his Grace's directions thereupon.

George Hickes.

Looked at from the modern point of view this interesting and important document suggests several reflections.

(1) The great importance attached to the consent of one who was after all a layman, and not even a lay member of the Church of England, may seem to savour of Erastianism, the very last thing which one associates with the Nonjurors. But it will be observed that here, as elsewhere, the Church is put above the State. 'The good fathers resolve rather to do this important matter *without*

[1] The name of 'William Giffard, R. of Great Bradley,' occurs in all lists of Nonjurors, and in a MS. book given to the Library of St. John's College, Cambridge, by the Rev. J. H. Lupton, and kindly lent to me by Professor J. E. B. Mayor, I find, among the accounts of the characters of various Nonjurors, the following extract from the *Daily Post*, on Friday, April 9, 1731, headed 'Mr. Giffard's Character': 'On Wednesday night (viz. April 7, 1731) died the Rev. Mr. William Giffard, who had borne the shocks of fortune for several years with singular patience and courage. He died in a very advanced age.'

his majestie's consent than not at all.' Nevertheless, it was most important, indeed essential, to have that consent if everything was to be done as they wished. If the Non-jurors were the true Church of England, then of course their bishops must be appointed as the Church of England appoints bishops. In other words, the old constitutional doctrine of the Royal Supremacy must be recognised, and none the less so because it was at present a shadowy supremacy far away, and not a substantial supremacy on the spot. When 'the King should enjoy his own again,' as they all hoped he would do, endless complications would arise if he had not given his sanction to the new consecrations by sending the *congé d'élire*. Moreover, the Act of Henry VIII., under which the consecrations were supposed to be made, laid great stress upon the part which the King was to take. 'Two honest and discreet spiritual persons, being learned and of good conversation,' were to be presented by the archbishop or bishop 'disposed to have any suffragan' to the King 'by writing under their seals, making humble request to his majesty to give to one such of the said two persons as shall please his majesty such title, name, style, and dignity of bishop of such of the sees specified, as the King's highness shall think most convenient for the same,'[1] and there are several other regulations in which the King plays a chief part. It will be seen that they could not comply with the Act literally by giving the King the choice of two, probably for lack of material—all the more reason why they should be very particular about complying with it where they could.

(2) An English Churchman's choler is inclined to rise when he hears that the Pope and two bishops in the Roman obedience were consulted in the matter. It was

[1] See Phillimore's *Ecclesiastical Law*, p. 78.

like the infatuated policy of King James to refer pointedly to his having done so. Of course, as a conscientious Roman Catholic he could not act otherwise; but one would have thought that past experience would have taught him that the less said about the matter the better.

(3) The clandestine nature of the whole transaction was repellent to the frankness and openness of the English character. Perhaps at this time of day we are hardly in a position to judge how far all this secrecy was necessary; but certainly if it *could* have been avoided it would have been very desirable. The Nonjurors themselves, except those few who had been let into the secret, do not appear to have known what took place. Robert Nelson lived close to Hickes in Ormond Street, and on the most intimate terms of friendship with him, without knowing that 'My neighbour the Dean' was a bishop. Thomas Hearne certainly knew nothing about the new consecrations in 1711—that is, seventeen years after they had taken place—and probably not for several years later. There may be, perhaps, nothing actually contrary to Church principles in the concealment. This very question is asked and grappled with in one of the appendices to Lee's 'Life of Kettlewell,' and also in other writings of the Nonjurors;[1] but Englishmen do not like mystery; and it is clear that, both at the time and ever since, the mystery in which the consecrations were shrouded has tended to raise a strong prejudice against them.

(4) The awkward questions arise, Was the Act of Henry VIII. under which the first consecrations took place really intended for any such purpose as that for which it was used? And if it was, had the suffragan any power beyond what he received by commission from his

[1] In one of the MS. books in the Library of St. John's, Cambridge, already referred to, there are several letters on the subject.

diocesan? And when the diocesan died did not the suffragan's commission die with him? It is a curious fact that Dr. Christopher Wordsworth, who revived this system of so-called suffragans by putting into force the Act of Henry VIII. in our own time, foresaw this difficulty some years before the revival; indeed, some years before he was a bishop himself.[1] Of course the Nonjurors were too well-read men not to perceive the difficulty; and they grappled with it bravely—whether successfully or not is another question. Indeed, the original idea was soon tacitly dropped. The first two were the only bishops who were consecrated as suffragans under Henry's Act. Thetford and Ipswich were carefully chosen as towns in the diocese of Norwich, and the Bishops of Thetford and Ipswich were supposed to be suffragans of the Bishop of Norwich; but none of the later bishops had any titular sees attached to them; they were bishops at large of the Catholic Church. It is only fair to add that two of the very ablest of the Nonjurors—Dr. Hickes in his 'Constitution of the Catholic Church,' and Charles Leslie in his 'Case of the Regale and Pontificate'—dealt with the whole subject of the new consecrations most learnedly and exhaustively; but they had a hard task which taxed even their abilities.

But when we turn from the question of consecration to the two individuals who were first consecrated, it must be owned that they were more than worthy of the doubtful elevation to which they were advanced.

George Hickes (1642–1715) was, in point of abilities and attainments, quite equal to the great divines of the Caroline era. He was fast rising to the highest ranks of his profession when the Revolution occurred, and put a stop to any further advancement. It was by the sheer

[1] See *Life of Bishop Christopher Wordsworth*, p. 223 (First Edition).

force of his own talents that he rose, for he had no particular advantages of birth or education, and no powerful friends, except those of his own making. He was the son of a large Yorkshire farmer—perhaps, one should say, a gentleman farmer—and was educated first at Thirsk and then at the Grammar School of North Allerton, the master of which, Thomas Smelt, throughout the Commonwealth instilled monarchical principles into his pupils, much in the same way as Dr. Busby did on a far larger scale at Westminster. As George Hickes's mother was the daughter of a clergyman, it is possible that the same seeds were sown at home; at any rate, he proved very receptive of them, and they bore ample fruit in later life. At the age of sixteen he was sent to his brother, John Hickes, who was nine years his senior, and who had imbibed quite opposite views. It was intended to make a merchant of him, but he showed so much intellectual promise that it was determined to send him to college, and accordingly he went to St. John's College, Oxford.

The Puritan reign was nearly, but not quite, over, and George Hickes, an ardent Royalist and Churchman, was involved in trouble with the authorities, and had to leave the college. Upon the Restoration he returned to Oxford, not to St. John's, but as 'poor scholar' or servitor to one of the restored Fellows at Magdalen College, and from thence took his degree of B.A. Then he migrated to Magdalen Hall, and in 1664 was elected to a Yorkshire fellowship at Lincoln College, and for seven years was what would now be called a college tutor. In 1675 he became rector of St. Ebbe's, Oxford, and in the same year chaplain to the Duke of Lauderdale, having been satisfied by his friend, Bishop Fell (who was also Dean of Christ Church), that the charges of immorality against the duke were unfounded, arising only from party malice.

In 1680 he was made prebendary of Worcester, and in the same year vicar of Allhallows Barking, which preferment he owed to Archbishop Sancroft. In 1681 he became a Royal chaplain, and in 1683 Dean of Worcester. In 1684 he declined the bishopric of Bristol, though it was intimated to him that he might retain his deanery *in commendam*. In 1685 the Rector of Lincoln College, Dr. Marshall, who was also Dean of Gloucester, and a man of considerable eminence, died, and Hearne tells us that 'Bishop *Fell*, who knew Dr. Hicks's worth, and had a true value for Men of Learning, labour'd all he could to have him Rector of Lincoln; but the Fellows, who knew he would have been for keeping up Discipline, preferr'd a Person of a quite Different Temper.'[1] This seems a rather unnecessary fling at the fellows and the successful candidate for the rectorship (Dr. Fitzherbert Adams), but it is borne out by Wood, who gives us also the following additional particulars:

> 1685, May 2, S[unday]. Fitzherbert Adams chose rector of Linc. Coll. against Dr. [George] Hicks. He had 9 voices and Dr. Hicks but 3. Occasioned by John Radcliff and [Edward] Hopkins[2] that they might have a governor that they might govern. Radcliff represented him to be a turbulent man, and that if he should be rector they should never be at quiet.[3]

In 1686 Hickes resigned the living of Allhallows Barking, and accepted that of Alvechurch, to hold *in commendam* with the deanery. Dean Hickes, though frequently accused of a leaning to popery, was, in point of fact, from first to last a staunch Protestant, in the literal sense of the word—that is, he was always ready to 'protest' in the strongest terms he could command, and

[1] Hearne's *Collections* (Oxf. Hist. Soc.), i. 322.

[2] Curiously enough this 'Edward Hopkins' afterwards became a Nonjuror.

[3] Wood's *Life and Times* (Oxf. Hist. Soc.), iii. 142.

these were *very* strong, both against papal errors in doctrine and papal encroachments in practice. All through his life he was a very *malleus Romanensium*, writing several most telling pieces against them. He also saw perfectly well what his Royal master was aiming at, and determined to resist him. In 1687 the Bishop of Worcester was seriously ill, and not expected to recover. Dean Hickes, like a war-horse sniffing the battle from afar, prepared himself and others for the attempt which he felt sure King James would make, in case of a vacancy, to foist one of his Roman or Romanising friends into the see. He wrote 'to assure the prebendaries that in such a case he would first write to the King, asking him to recall any *congé d'élire* for such a person, and then, if necessary, endure any penalty rather than summon the chapter to elect.' Happily, the bishop recovered, so the case did not occur. But the dean rushed into the fray—though, of course, he had no call to do so—when the infatuated King issued his Second Declaration of Indulgence the same year. He was equally staunch in supporting James in his adversity as he had been in resisting him in his prosperity, and at the Revolution became one of the most uncompromising of Jacobites and Nonjurors. He was first suspended, and then deprived in the usual course, but was allowed to remain unmolested at the deanery for three months after his deprivation—that is, from the beginning of February to the beginning of May 1691. Then, on hearing that his successor had been appointed (Talbot, who rose in time to the Palatine see of Durham), he took the bold course of affixing with his own hand to the entrance-gate of the choir of his cathedral a protest, an extract from which may be here inserted:

Whereas the office, place and dignity of Dean of this

Cathedral Church was given and presented unto me for a freehold during my natural life by Letters Patent under the Broad Seal of King Charles II.:

Whereas I am given to understand that my right to the said office and dignity has of late been called in question, and that one Mr. Talbot, M.A., prefers a title to the same:

I do hereby publicly protest and declare that I do claim a legal right and title to the said office and dignity of Dean against the said Mr. Talbot and all other persons pretending title to the same—and so forth.[1]

This was regarded as an affront to Government, and, in order to prevent arrest, Hickes was obliged to make his escape, and to lie for some time in concealment and disguise. He found a refuge, of all places in the world, in the country parsonage at Ambrosden, or Amersden, of Mr. White Kennett, the man who, next to Bishop Burnet, was perhaps most obnoxious to the Nonjurors, and who certainly wrote and spoke most severely of *them*. This bringing together of the extremest of Nonjurors and the extremest of anti-Nonjurors seemed like a cat and dog arrangement, which must infallibly result in an immediate and violent quarrel. But, strange to say, this was not the case. For a time the plan answered admirably, and brought about most important results, quite apart from controversial divinity and politics. Perhaps at the time of the residence of the two men under the same roof they were not quite so wide apart as they afterwards became; White Kennett certainly drifted further and further away from his old moorings (he had been bred up a Tory and a High Churchman); Hickes probably grew stricter and

[1] The document will be found, printed in full, in an Appendix to the *Life and Compleat Works of Kettlewell*. The protest, addressed to 'Dr. John Jephcot, Sub-Dean of the Cathedral, &c.' is all in manuscript among the Rawlinson MSS. (D 373) in the Bodleian Library. It is 'corrected from an Original under the Dean's own hand and seal, this 2nd of July, 1731.—Witness, Wm. Bedford.'

stricter, both in his theological and his political principles, as his years advanced. Still, at the time when the two men lived together at Ambrosden—that is, during part of the last decade of the seventeenth century—the differences between them were quite sufficient to make the harmony almost phenomenal.

How it was managed had best be told in the words of Kennett's biographer:

> Having contracted an intimate acquaintance with Dr. Hicks, he [Kennett] received him freely into his vicarage-house there [Amersden]; and finding that by his condition of suffering for the cause of King James, his head and thoughts were too much determined to Politics; by which he would be apt to disturb the world and expose himself, Mr. Kennet, to divert him from that mischief (as well as for other reasons) desired his instruction in the Saxon and Septentrional Tongues, &c.
>
> While Dr. Hickes was thus pleased by the Country Vicar, it gave the latter the opportunity to interest the Doctor to look more upon those studies, to review his Saxon and Islandic [*sic*] Grammar &c. It was upon this frequent Discourse and Importunity of Mr. Kennett, that Dr. Hickes, then and there, laid the foundation of that noble work which he brought to perfection in about 7 years after.[1]
>
> But the Doctor, being then under a legal Incapacity (which, however, was soon taken off without his Trouble or charge by the generosity of the Lord Somers),[2] he wore a lay-habit, and affected to be unknown, till a Fellow of a College in Oxford coming over, and calling the Doctor by his name, he thought there was a danger in staying, and so he went off immediately to some more obscure retreat.[3]

[1] That is *The Thesaurus*, &c., described in the chapter on 'Nonjurors' Literature,' *infra*, p. 414.

[2] In 1699 Lord Somers, the Whig Lord Chancellor, procured for him a *nolle prosequi*, which stayed all further proceedings against him, in consideration of the great services he had rendered to literature on non-controversial subjects. Lord Somers is said to have interposed in his behalf in gratitude for having been made counsel for the Seven Bishops.

[3] *Life of Bishop White Kennett*, 1730, published anonymously, but known to have been written by the Rev. William Newton, vicar of Gillingham, Dorset.

Dr. Hickes, having stayed for a while in London, found shelter under the hospitable roof of Lady Pakington at Westwood, in Worcestershire, then in a small cottage on Bagshot Heath, then in Gloucester Green, Oxford, then for many years in Great Ormond Street, London, where he died on December 15, 1715, and was buried by his friend Spinckes in the churchyard of St. Margaret, Westminster.[1] He regularly officiated at one of the most noted of the Nonjuring Oratories, as will appear in a later chapter.[2] He had married a kindred spirit in 1679, Frances, daughter of Charles Mallory who had suffered for his loyalty during 'the troubles'; with her he lived most happily until her death, which occurred just a year before his own. They had no family. He had two brothers: Ralph, to whom no doubt Hearne refers when he says, 'Dr. Hicks has a Brother a Physitian, who was first a Presbyterian, and afterwards converted to y^e^ Ch. of Engl. by his Bro. and now practises Physick in London,'[3] and John Hickes, of whom a little more must be said.

It is a remarkable fact that two brothers, John and George Hickes, should have suffered for conscience' sake, the one death, the other the loss of all his worldly prospects, on quite opposite sides. John Hickes held under the Commonwealth the perpetual curacy of Saltash, in Cornwall, from which he was ejected by the Act of Uniformity in 1662. He became a champion of Non-conformity, joined the Monmouth Rebellion in 1685, and was executed at Taunton in the autumn of that year. He wrote to his wife from prison:—'Monday last my

[1] The following is an extract from the Burial Register of St. Margaret's, Westminster: '1715, Dec. 18.—The Rev. (or Rt. Rev.) George Hicks [*sic*], D.D., Dean of Worcester, which Deanery he lost by refusing to take the Oaths at the Revolution; he was consecrated Bp. Suffragan of Thetford by Dr. Lloyd, the deprived Bp. of Norwich.'

[2] See *infra*, p. 283.

[3] *Collections* (Oxf. Hist. Soc.), i. 260.

brother went to London to try what could be done for me; what the success will be, I know not.' The dean offered 100*l.* to Lord Shannon to procure a pardon for his brother by the King's personal favour. But he was in a most embarrassing position; natural affection led him one way, his ideas of justice another. Holding as he did the doctrine of non-resistance in its strictest and most uncompromising form, he no doubt believed that his brother had justly forfeited his life by his glaring act of rebellion. John Hickes was quite as unbending in his opinions in an opposite direction; the two had probably long been alienated, and time had done its work. All this should be taken into account in reading the following letter, written only two days after John Hickes's most sad death:—

Worcester: Oct. 17, 1685.

Much Honoured Sir,—At my return to the Deanery, I found your very kind letter for which I return you my most hearty thanks, and will ever acknowledge your great charity, and respects towards my late wretched brother, which shall remain a debt upon my account as long as I live. I must also entreat you to return my most humble duty and thankes to my good Lord Bishop[1] for his eminent condescension and charity towards him in praying with him, and for him, and for suffering so unworthy a body to be buried in Glassenbury Church. I take this last great respect of my Lord's to be done to myself, and desire in a particular manner to be thankful for it. I am glad he made such professions of his loyalty, and gave the people such good exhortations to be true and faithful to their lawfull sovereign and to detest all manner of rebellion, but am very sorry that he persisted in justifying his nonconformity: this part of his last behaviour fills my heart with grief, though I was prepared to expect it, as knowing very well how ignorant he was of the true nature of Church communion, and how much he was prepossessed with false notions and principles in matters relating to church discipline and government. I humbly entreat you to

[1] Dr. Ken, whose Christian kindness towards the poor Dissenter is very characteristic.

send on the paper he delivered to you, you may direct it to me at the Deanery in Worcester, and I also pray you to let me know, whether he left any charge, or message to his children in word or writeing, that they should live in the communion of our church and whether he desired, and received the holy sacrament, and if not, whether he refused, or it was refused to him, as might justly have been done to a man persisting in schisme. I also desire to know, whether his body was delivered whole to his friends, and if so, whether it was don by order from my Lord Chief Justice; I wrote to his Lordship to beg so much mercy of him, and if he granted my petition, it is fit I should know it, and give him thankes. I should also be glad to know what my Lord said to him at his tryall, and condemnation, and whether he said anything to the people in justification of his nonconformity at the time of his execution, and if he acknowledged his punishment to be the righteous judgment of God for his sin of rebellion. There is a worthy gentleman of the Church of Welles, to whome I beseech you give my humble service and particular respects, I mean Dr. Creighton,[1] and to the good Deane,[2] if he be there.

I doubt my curiosity hath made me too troublesome to you, but I assure you, you may in requiteall command me any service, for I am in all sincerity, dear Sir,

Your most obliged, affect. and humble servant,

GEORGE HICKES.[3]

The tone of this letter may seem, as Mr. Macray says, somewhat hard, but with Hickes the cause of the Church, in its minutest details, was the cause of Christ; and 'he that loveth father or mother'—much more brother—'more than me is not worthy of me.'

[1] Son of a former Bishop of Bath and Wells. He was precentor of Wells for no less than sixty years, 1674–1734.

[2] Dr. Ralph Bathurst, who was also President of Trinity College, Oxford. He was a strong Royalist, and in the time of 'the troubles' had frequently gone from Oxford to Launton to assist Bishop Skinner in his secret ordinations there. He would be a man after Dean Hickes's heart.

[3] The letter is addressed, 'For the Reverend Mr. Robert Eyre, Chaplain to my Lord Bishop of Welles, at the pallace in Welles, Somersets.' The original is in the Bodleian Library. A copy of it was sent by the Rev. W. D. Macray to *The English Historical Review*, and was published in that periodical, in October 1887, p. 752.

Hickes was not really an unfeeling, but a very warm-hearted man; few men had more friends who loved and reverenced him, and whom he loved with all the ardour of an enthusiastic temperament; but he loved his Church better, and in its interests would sacrifice the closest of natural ties. He carried the same principles and temper with him into the camp of the Nonjurors, and his motto always was 'No surrender.' An interesting correspondence took place between him and Bishop Ken at the commencement of the eighteenth century, which was begun by Ken under the impression that Hickes would 'concur with him in hearty desires for closing the rupture with the Established Church.' Ken's letter is written in a truly Christian tone, of course:[1] but, holding the principles he did, I do not see how Hickes could possibly have accepted Ken's proposals. At any rate he did not; but wrote a reply which drew from Ken another letter, evidently written in an irascible frame of mind like that in which the good man wrote to Bishop Lloyd;[2] but, as usual, he struggled against his irascibility and overcame it. He concludes:

> You have been more than once severe upon me. I leave you at your liberty to dissent from me, and if you will not indulge me the like liberty to dissent from you, I must take it, though without any breach of friendship on my part. God keep us in his most holy fear. Your most affectionate friend and Br.
>
> Tho. B. & W.[3]

That they should continue to 'dissent' was inevitable. Not only were they men of very different temperaments, but they started from different premisses; Ken regarded the separation from the National Church as purely personal

[1] See the letter in full in Plumptre's *Life of Ken*, ii. 108–9. A MS. copy of Hickes's answer, which is of great length, is in the Library of St. John's, Cambridge.

[2] See *supra*, p. 44, 66.

[3] See Plumptre, ii. 110–1.

and purely temporary; Hickes as one of principle and final, until a distinct recantation should be made. Ken belonged to the extreme right of one section of the Nonjurors, Hickes to the extreme left of the other. How could two such men agree unless they 'agreed to differ'?

How you estimate Hickes just depends upon the end of the telescope from which you contemplate him. Look at him from one end and he will perhaps appear rather unduly magnified; look at him from the other and he will appear unduly belittled. To many Nonjurors he was the brave and consistent champion of their cause, who maintained definite and intelligible principles, from which no earthly power could induce him to swerve one inch to the right hand or to the left. 'Nothing,' complains Mr. Noble, 'could teach him moderation.'[1] No! and nothing would, if he had lived to this day; for he thought moderation was only another word for trimming. All through he was probably the most influential man among the Nonjurors, converting more to that little communion than any other man; and after the death of Bishop Lloyd in 1709, he was not only their virtual, but their actual and nominal head, so that they were sometimes called 'Hickesites,' and their communion 'the communion of Dr. Hickes.'

There was another reason for his supremacy which is well pointed out by a modern writer: 'He was the last of the great divines of the seventeenth century, and the last of that generation of Nonjurors who had already gained position and distinction before the Church was rent asunder by the Revolution, and who were known and valued in a larger world than that narrow space in which the Nonjurors were compelled to move.'[2]

[1] Granger's *Biographical History of England*, continued by Noble, i. 120.
[2] *Undercurrents of Church Life in the Seventeenth Century*, p. 36.

Hence he was sometimes called by his party 'the good Father Hickes.'[1] In 1696, feeling how uncertain life is, and desiring that there might be no mistake about the principles which uniformly guided him, he wrote 'A Declaration concerning the Faith and Religion in which he lived and intended to die,' which, considering the supreme importance of the man from the point of view of this work, deserves to be quoted at some length. No one, I think, can read it without perceiving that it palpitates with the deepest emotions of the writer, and that he would have been quite ready to go to the stake rather than act inconsistently with the principles he here enunciates.

I profess [he writes] and declare the Church of England as it was governed and administered by true and lawful and rightful Bishops before the Revolution to have been a true and sound part of the Catholick Church; and I testify my unalterable adherence to all the doctrines of it contained in the Thirty Nine Articles, in opposition to the corrupt and dangerous practice of the Roman Church and other dangerous doctrines and practices; and this I do to vindicate myself and my suffering brethren from the opinion which the common people and other ignorant and inconsiderate persons have taken up of us because we have withdrawn ourselves from the public assemblies and worship in the parochial churches.

I profess my unalterable adherence to the deprived bishops, and their canonical successors and colleagues.

I am fully persuaded and declare that the Church of England now consists in the deprived Bishops, so called, and that faithful remnant which adheres to them, and that the other Archbishops and Bishops, and the great majority adhering to them, are guilty of a great schism to be lamented by all good Christians.

I believe the doctrine of non-resistance as taught in the Homilies to be not only a doctrine of this church, but a principal Point of Christianity.

I bless God who gave me courage and constancy to refuse

[1] See *Life of Bishop White Kennett*, p. 48.

the oath, and making me stand in the time of Trial, when so many others to my astonishment fell. However in that great Apostasy of the Nation it pleased God to reserve to Himself a Remnant of faithful persons, and I magnify Him with all my soul, and will ever praise Him as long as I have my being, for making me one of them, and thinking me worthy to suffer in so righteous a cause as that under which I have been engaged.

I praise God for giving me an active zeal to defend our cause in several pieces. . . . And as I trust I wrote them with a zeal not unsuitable to, or unworthy of our glorious Cause, so I wrote them with an intention so pure and with so great a regard to truth that to my knowledge I have not injured any one person in them.

But if I have been misinformed about any . . . . I ask God's pardon for it. If my zeal for Truth and Righteousness and the Constitution, Rights and Unity of the Church hath, notwithstanding my care to the contrary, transported me too far, and made me write against any one of our adversaries with more indignation and severity of expression than was consistent with strictness of Christian meekness and charity, I beg his Pardon for that, and the favourable construction of all good men, who know what allowances are to be made to the best men, that write controversies on such subjects and occasions, and against such insulting and provoking Adversaries, and in such degenerate and unhappy Times.

I beseech God of His infinite mercy to turn the hearts of this great people, and those who mislead them, that they may return to their obedience, and call back their exiled king, and so put an end to those distractions and confusions, which can have no end till the hereditary king by lineal descent comes to wear the Crown.

I also declare my hearty sorrow for the schism which the whole nation, except a small remnant, is guilty of in ejecting and forsaking their rightful Bishops and Pastors, and I beseech God so to touch the hearts and understandings of the people and the clergy, who mislead them that they may repent etc.

I beseech God to give the king[1] a sight of his errors and true repentance for his apostasy from the true religion in which he was baptised, and for which his Father was both a Confessor

[1] That is, of course, King James.

and Martyr; and to bless and convert the Queen; and as for the Prince of Wales, I pray God to look upon him, as the grandson of the Royal Martyr, that he may live to sit upon the Throne of his Ancestors, and become a Josiah to this Church and Kingdom; and give him grace timely to discern the errors of his education, and if, by God's Providence, this paper happen to come to his sight, I desire and conjure him, by all that I have done for the Royal Cause, to read the excellent works of his grandfather and great-grandfather, who were learned and religious kings, and much more able and competent judges than his Royal Father, in the great controversy between us and the Church of Rome.

I beg God to comfort and support the whole suffering Remnant, . . . particularly the Bishops and clergy, and especially to direct our holy Fathers, the Bishops, that they may provide for the Church in times to come, and not leave the Flock which adheres to them, like Sheep without a Shepherd; and their Successors in all they do and suffer for His sake, and when the time of healing and reunion shall come, they may resettle the Church in Truth, Peace and Unity.

As I have always maintained the just rights and prerogatives of the Crown, so to the best of my understanding I have maintained the lawful rights of the people. What the Constitution and Law give the King, I will render to his Majesty. What Immunities, Rights, and Liberties the people have by our Constitution, I will claim and defend as a subject; and this I declare for the sake of some men who have misrepresented and slandered many truly loyal and conscientious persons, as if they were for arbitrary power and betraying of the Liberties of their country, because they teach and maintain our kings to be truly Sovereigns, and as such to be irresistible, indeposable, and unaccountable to the People. But it is one thing for a King, as supreme, to have those prerogatives of Supremacy, and another to have unlimited and arbitrary Power: For the Law limits both King's and People's rights, and I neither am, nor ever was, nor ever will be for arbitrary Government, or boundless power in the one, or boundless liberty in the other.

This Profession I have made in my health, that I may not have to do it at the time of my death.

As a matter of fact, Hickes lived for nearly twenty years after making this 'Declaration'; but he never

swerved from it, and indeed referred to it as expressing his convictions in his will, made within a year of his death. It tells its own tale—the tale of one who was a Nonjuror, a Jacobite, and a Protestant. The only passage in it which requires comment is that in which he refers to any harsh language which he may have used against his adversaries.

That he *did* use such language is one of the chief charges brought against him, and it is certainly true. It would be strange if it were not, for Hickes was a man of strong and definite convictions, which he expressed in the most downright and outspoken terms. He was a voluminous writer, and much that he wrote was written in the white heat of controversy. He felt very keenly the personal injustice which he thought had been done to himself and his fellow-sufferers, and still more keenly the inconsistency with their own often-expressed sentiments of many who had taken their places, and he frequently wrote under severe provocation. Here is one of his strictures *en masse*:

The Dethroning and Depriving of Rightful Canonical Bishops by the Secular Powers for adhering to their Christian Duty, is yet a greater Sin, and also receives further Aggravation, when those Secular Powers are not Lawful, but Usurping Powers: And those Priests or Bishops, who dare Usurp the Thrones of Rightful, Canonical Bishops, so invalidly, so unjustly, so illegally deprived, and driven from their Thrones, are of all others the most detestable Usurpers, Breakers of the Bond of Peace, Unity, Subordination, and all Charity in the City of God; very *Corahs*, from whom the Lord's People ought to separate by the Laws of the Gospel and the Doctrine of the Catholick Church: They can perform no valid Acts of Priesthood; their very Prayers are Sin; their Sacraments are no Sacraments; their Absolutions are null and void; God ratifies nothing in Heaven which they do in His Name upon Earth; they, and all that adhere to them, are out of the Church; they can claim no Benefits of God's Promises, no not of His Assisting Grace, nor of the Remission

of Sins through the Merits of Christ's Blood. Nay, though they should dye Martyrs in the Schism, their Martyrdom would not be accepted, they would lose the Crown of Glory promised to it; nay, tho' they had many Lives to lose in Martyrdom, or could dye Martyrs more than once, they could not make amends for their Sin with their Blood.[1]

Of those who 'dared to usurp the Thrones of Rightful, Canonical Bishops,' the two most obnoxious to Dr. Hickes were Archbishop Tillotson and Bishop Burnet; the former as the Coryphæus of the 'Revolution Church' and supplanter of the Nonjuring leader, Archbishop Sancroft; the latter as the real *fons et origo mali*, who, though he did not actually succeed a deprived bishop, was the chief cause of all the Nonjuring bishops being deprived. When, then, Bishop Burnet preached a funeral sermon on Archbishop Tillotson—in which it must be confessed that passages occur sufficiently provoking to all who held the principles of the Nonjurors—it is not surprising that Hickes took the opportunity of 'killing two birds with one stone,' and published (anonymously, indeed, but the authorship was obvious) 'Some Discourses upon Dr. Burnet and Dr. Tillotson occasioned by the late Funeral Sermon of the Former upon the Later' (1695). The Preface is not promising. 'I know very well,' says its writer, 'that it [the book] will be called a Libel, and a Defamatory Libel; but I care not for that, since so many excellent books were so miscalled in the Times of former Usurpations.' Neither is the Introduction, in which the obnoxious sermon is described as 'preacht at the Funeral of the late Dean of Canterbury,[2] whom the preacher stiles, By Divine Providence Lord

[1] *The Constitution of the Catholick Church, and the Nature and Consequences of Schism*, pp. 32–3.

[2] It will be observed that Hickes does not even recognise Tillotson as Dean of St. Paul's, because he had been appointed to that post under William III.

Archbishop of Canterbury and Metropolitan of All England.' But I am bound to say that, on reading both Burnet's sermon and Hickes's discourses upon it, I did not find either so exasperating as the many comments which I had read upon both led me to expect. First, as to the sermon itself. Considering that it was preached before Tillotson's old congregation at St. Lawrence Jewry, who loved and were proud of him, it really does not go beyond what would be fully expected from the preacher in the way of panegyric. The greater part is a touching tribute, evidently from the heart, of one friend to another. Given Burnet's premisses, he could hardly have said less. But, Burnet-like, he cannot resist the temptation to improve the occasion by making a most unwarranted and exasperating attack—which, even if warranted, would have been unnecessary and out of place—upon the deprived bishops. He perverts their natural unwillingness to create a schism into a desire to retain their sees; denies their title to be called 'Confessors, indeed, to which they afterwards pretended.' 'They concealed their Principles, and withdrew from the public worship of the Church, and yet dared not to act or speak against it. They hoped at this rate to have held their Sees and enjoyed their Revenues.' If Hickes had confined himself to an answer to this attack it would have been well. But in eighty-eight closely printed pages he picked in pieces the whole sermon, beginning with the text: 'I have fought a good fight,' &c., implying that Tillotson had *not* fought a good fight, and had *not* kept the faith, and showing in detail that the preacher had given him 'a character much above his merits.' Against Burnet himself he rakes up many old stories which had best have been left in oblivion. But it was the depreciation of Tillotson which gave the greatest offence. There

is something peculiarly ungracious in passing strictures on a man just after his death, and the funeral sermon might safely have been left to be taken *cum grano*, as it would have been.

It is fair to add that Hickes draws a marked distinction between Burnet and Tillotson on the one hand and 'the main body of the clergy' on the other, who,

> God be thanked, are of quite different spirits; they do not persecute their old brethren for their strict doctrines, but pity and help to support them. They know by experience how hard it was for Conscience to overcome the difficulties of the New Oath; and therefore they retain very tender compassions for those who could not overcome them, and honour them in their Hearts, as men of Principles, who are most faithful to English Monarchy, zealous for the honour and prosperity of the Royal Family, and the Catholick Doctrines and Rights of the Church.

And then he appends a note.

> Among the worthy men here described was Mr. Wharton, who put out Archbishop Laud's works; Dr. Dove, who, as all the world knows, took the New Oath with so much reluctance; Dr. Scot, who first refused the bishopric of Chester because he could not take the Oath of Homage, then another bishopric, then the deanery of Worcester, and a prebend of Windsor, because they all were places of deprived men.

This last passage explains, or, at least, illustrates, a curious feature in Dr. Hickes. Though he held the very strictest views in the most uncompromising fashion, he still retained in a remarkable degree his friendship with men who thought quite differently from himself. Whether he believed that the men (as is often the case) were better than their opinions, or whether, as some would say, he himself was more charitable than his own opinions, the fact remains that his practice was far more liberal than his theory. He lived, as we have seen, for some time

amicably in the same house with White Kennett, who was more obnoxious than most of the 'Revolution Churchmen' to the Nonjurors, because he was regarded by them as a renegade from the cause to which he had once adhered. He kept up his friendship with Dean Comber, after the latter had committed that most heinous of all offences—accepting the preferment of which a staunch Nonjuror (Dean Granville) had been deprived. He continued, not only in correspondence, but on visiting terms, with Ralph Thoresby, who was still half a dissenter. The fact that his old pupil at Lincoln College, Sir George Wheler, accepted preferment in the 'Revolution Church' did not in the least interfere with the mutual respect and affection which the two entertained for one another.[1] In his Preface to the 'Thesaurus' he spoke of William Nicolson, Bishop of Carlisle, who was an uncompromising foe of the Nonjurors, and as a border bishop was nervously alarmed about the advances of the Jacobites and advocated the adoption of stricter measures for their repression, as a man

> to be honourably named for his manifold erudition, specially illustrious on account of his knowledge of the Northern literature, that highly reverend prelate, who when very many times consulted by us, quite as an oracle, in difficult and obscure matters, always gave us answers full of light, in which he explained everything, with the utmost courtesy and without delay.

In the same Preface he made honourable mention of *Edmund Gibson*, afterwards Bishop of London, then the domestic chaplain and *protégé* of Archbishop Tenison, the Nonjurors' abhorrence, and of *White Kennett*, once his friend, now becoming more and more his enemy,

[1] See the *Memoirs of Sir George Wheler, Prebendary of Durham, passim.*

that reverend and most learned man, who seven years ago often urged me to gird myself to this work about the ancient Northern letters, which, as they seemed to him worthy of the knowledge of all men, in his house I began without delay our books, in which, now that they are at length brought to a close, if I have in any way helped the republic of letters, to him, as the auspice, all that I have done is to be attributed.

Friendship is never put to a more severe strain than when two friends who have long walked together come at the last to the parting of the ways; but Hickes's friendship with Robert Nelson could bear even this strain. 'Not even the conformity of Nelson to the Established Church in 1709 impaired the intimacy of his friendship with the leader of the Nonjurors [Hickes] till the death of Nelson one year before his friend.'[1] Hickes also remained to the last a personal friend of Nathaniel Marshall, who was actually a chaplain of King George I. and a most persistent and formidable opponent of the Nonjurors. In fact, so friendly were they that Marshall could hardly believe his eyes when he read the posthumous publication of Hickes's 'Collection of Papers,' &c., in 1716. This work more than anything else led to the publication of Marshall's 'Defence of our Constitution in Church and State, or an Answer to the late Charge of the Nonjurors, accusing us of Heresy and Schism, Perjury and Treason' (1717), as it also led to Hoadly's 'Preservative against the Nonjurors'—two of the most powerful books ever written against the Nonjurors.

From my personal acquaintance with Dr. Hickes [writes Marshall] I could relate many circumstances which passed between myself and him, from whence any reasonable man might conclude that he thought me no schismatic. . . . For any

[1] Secretan's *Memoirs of the Life and Times of the Pious Robert Nelson*, p. 67.

man to converse, as he was pleased to do with me, with all possible tokens of friendship, freedom, and affection, and at the same time to believe me in a damnable state, without one word of admonition to me concerning my danger, are circumstances which I know not how for my life to bring together, nor to make consistent; and therefore I yet withhold my assent to the truth of what the publisher hath said in the collection of Papers assigned to him, that they are printed from any faithful copy of Dr. Hickes' writings.[1]

But Hickes's conduct seems to me very intelligible. He was not responsible for Mr. Marshall's soul; and, whatever the differences between them might be, he felt it his duty to live in peace and amity with those who were brought into contact with him. Moreover, it must never be forgotten that, with his intense belief in the doctrine of an intermediate state (a primitive doctrine which all but slipped out of eighteenth century theology), Hickes would not have meant quite the same by 'a damnable state' as Marshall would probably mean by it.

Hickes's complaisance, however, by no means pleased all his Nonjuring friends. Thomas Hearne, in spite of his reverence for Hickes, whom he calls 'a man, if any one in England is, most learned, most upright, most sagacious, and (so great is his virtue and modesty) far removed from ambition and the desire of honours and riches,'[2] was much displeased at it. He thinks it 'far beneath him [Hickes], and looked upon as a Piece of Indiscretion to cringe to low, fanatical Fellows,'[3] one of those 'fellows' being John Potter, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, whom Hickes had praised in one of his Prefaces. But Hearne forgave him this weakness, for in the same year (1712) he writes to Hilkiah Bedford,

[1] *Defence*, &c., p. 179. [2] See *Collections* (Oxf. Hist. Soc.), ii. 293.
[3] *Ibid.* ii. 334; also iii. 384.

'I hope y^e^ Dean is recovered; for I heartily pray that God would continue the Life of this Great and Good Man, upon whom so much depends.'[1] Bedford was the closest friend Hickes ever had since the death of Kettlewell; he made him his literary executor, and Bedford was engaged in writing the Life of Hickes—a task which it is much to be lamented that he never completed. Hickes died at the close of 1715, and his death was an era in Nonjuring annals.

The other bishop, who was consecrated at the same time and in the same place, was not so prominent a man as Hickes; but he was a man of considerable mark in his day, and was fully equal, both in abilities and attainments, and also in piety and general character, to the post for which he was chosen.

Thomas Wagstaffe (1645–1712) was a member of an old Warwickshire family, more than one member of which had been distinguished on the Royalist side in the Civil War. He was educated at the Charterhouse, and at New Inn Hall, Oxford, where he graduated in 1667. He was ordained deacon in 1669 by Bishop Hacket, of Lichfield, and priest in the same year by Bishop Henshaw, of Peterborough, when he was instituted to the benefice of Martinsthorpe. He was also chaplain to Sir Richard Temple and curate of Stow. In 1684 he became Chancellor and Prebendary of Lichfield, and in the same year was presented by the Crown to the rectory of St. Margaret Pattens, with which the neighbouring parish of St. Gabriel, Fenchurch Street, in the City of London, had been united after the Great Fire. In 1689 he refused to take the oath, and of course lost all his preferments. He was not reduced to the straits to which some of the Nonjurors were, for his family connections would hardly

[1] *Collections* (Oxf. Hist. Soc.), iii. 496.

have allowed him to be penniless, and he is said to have 'studied physic before his admission to Holy Orders.'[1] When, therefore, he was deprived of all his clerical income he contrived to maintain himself and his family, which became numerous, by practising physic in London.

Among those who consulted him professionally were Francis Turner, deprived Bishop of Ely, and Archbishop Sancroft. He was with the latter at Fressingfield, partly perhaps as an intimate friend, partly as a medical adviser, for some time during the archbishop's last illness, of which he has given us a most touching and vivid account.[2] He does not appear to have officiated regularly in any of the Nonjuring oratories, nor to have exercised any episcopal functions, for his name does not occur in connection with any of the few ordinations that took place during his episcopate; and, as there were no more episcopal consecrations until after his death, he had no opportunity of doing that part of a bishop's work. But he always identified himself thoroughly with the Nonjuring cause, writing ably in its behalf, and taking a prominent part in the scheme for raising a fund for the relief of the suffering clergy, for which he was apprehended and had to appear with the rest before the Privy Council; but he was soon released from custody. He still continued to take an active part in the benevolent scheme of relief; for Hearne tells us as late as 1705 that 'Mr. Wagstaffe [with Mr. Spinckes] is imployed to distribute such moneys as are given by the

[1] See Miss Strickland's *Lives of the Seven Bishops*, p. 144. An eminent living physician (Dr. Norman Moore) says that 'Thomas Wagstaffe, the Nonjuror, carried on a practice of physic, which as it was based on academical training and extensive reading, and was undertaken from a necessity due to a fidelity to conscience, was not interfered with by the College of Physicians, which then had power to stop all unlicensed practice.' *Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. lviii., *sub nomine* 'Wagstaffe, William.'

[2] See *A Letter out of Suffolk*, &c., described below.

chief Jacobites for charitable uses.'[1] But he passed the later years of his life in his native county, in his own house at Binley, where he died.[2] He was very active with his pen, writing chiefly, but not exclusively, on Nonjuring subjects, and by universal consent he is regarded as an able writer. Even Lord Macaulay, who of course vehemently disagrees with him, and calls him 'a fierce and uncompromising Nonjuror,'[3] owns that he was 'a writer whom the Jacobite schismatics justly regarded as one of their ablest chiefs.'[4] Hearne, who, equally of course, agreed with him, says 'he is a man of very good Parts, and considerable Learning,'[5] and the 'Postboy,' in announcing his death in October 1712, says:

> He was a man of extraordinary judgment, exemplary piety, and unusual learning; and had he not had the misfortune to dissent from the established government by not taking the oaths, as he had all the qualities of a great divine, and a governor of the Church, so he would have filled deservedly some of the highest stations in it.

Wagstaffe's writings fully bear out these high estimates of his intellectual power, and it is a curious instance of the fact that the enforced withdrawal of the Nonjurors from public life made them active with their pens, that all his writings date from after the Revolution; in other words, he published nothing till he was nearer fifty than forty years of age. His best known work is an able defence of the Royal authorship of the Εἰκὼν Βασιλική, entitled a 'Vindication of King Charles the Martyr,' &c.

[1] *Collections* (Oxf. Hist. Soc.), i. 30.

[2] He must, however, have been living in London in 1707, for in that year his relative, William Wagstaffe, went to live with him and then acquired a taste for medical studies, and became an eminent physician. William married Thomas Wagstaffe's daughter.

[3] *History of England*, ch. xvii. (vol. ii. p. 260).

[4] *Id.* ch. xx. (vol. ii. p. 500).

[5] *Collections*, i. 38.

(1693). Of those directly connected with the Nonjuring controversy, the earliest was published anonymously in 1690, under the title of 'An Answer to a late Pamphlet entituled Obedience and Submission to the Present Government demonstrated from Bishop Overall's Convocation Book. With a Postscript in answer to Dr. Sherlock's Case of Allegiance.' It is written in a bright, lively style, and the subject is ably argued out. An extract from it will give the reader some idea of the man. The pamphlet to which it was an answer was also anonymous, but was known to be the work of Zachary Taylor, vicar of Ormskirk,[1] and was supposed to have helped to bring about the conversion (or, as Wagstaffe would have said, the *per*version) of William Sherlock.

The author [says Wagstaffe] begins with charging the nonswearers with *Malice* or *Ignorance*, for reproaching those of the Church of England who have taken the oaths with deserting their Principles. Perhaps he thinks it a very malicious thing in them to be deprived of their livings and Preferments; for what other instances of *Malice* they have been guilty of I cannot devise. Well, it was spightfully done of them to lose their Livelihoods, and in such a reflecting manner, to reproach those who swore, and kept or advanced theirs: Whereas they might have taken the Oaths, and if they could not with a good conscience, at least they ought to have done it to save the reputation of their brethren. If by *Ignorance*, he means they do not know, but those have deserted their Principles, for my Part, I confess the fact. . . . They [the swearers] have often been called upon to shew the consistency of their present Practices either with the general principles of the Church of England or with their own Principles, but they will not do it; and this author still keeps us in *Ignorance*. They have plenty of Arguments taken out of Parsons the Jesuit, and from the Rebels of 1642, and from the Advocates of Cromwell's Usurpation. These we meet with in every Pamphlet, and a man may look his eyes out before he can find any other; and this author is the first

[1] See Hearne's *Collections*, iii. 389.

that ever pretended to produce any public act of the Church of England in favour of such Practices [p. 1].[1]

[1] It may interest some readers to see the Apographum of the consecration of Wagstaffe, which *mutato nomine* applies to Hickes.

Apographum consecrationis &c. R. A. Viri Thomæ Wagstaffe, A.M., 1693.

In Dei Nomine, Amen.

Acta habita gesta et expedita in negotio Consecrationis reverendi viri Thomæ Wagstaffe Artium Magistri, in Episcopum Suffraganeum sive pastorem ecclesiarum de Ipswich nominati et electi in vigiliis S^cti^ Matthiæ Apostoli, viz. vigesimo tertio die mensis Februarii an^o^ Dñi milles^o^ sexcentes^o^ nonages^o^ tertio, an^o^ regni illustrissimi principis ac dñi dñi Jacobi secundi, Dei grā Angl. Scot. Franciæ et Hiberniæ Regis fidei defensoris decimo in capella sive oratorio reverendi in Christo patris ac dñi, dñi Thomæ, permissione divina Petriburgensis Epī et parochia de Enfield, coram reverendis in Christo patribus ac dñis domino Gulielmo permissione divina Norvicensi Epō et Francisco eadem permissione Eliensi Epō necnon Thoma eadem permissione Petriburgensi Epō, commissariis in hac parte (inter alios) legitimè fulcitis et constitutis. Præsente etiam me Rob^to^ Douglas in actorem scribam in hac parte assumpto, prout sequitur, viz.:

Die et loco prædictis inter horam nonam et undecimam ante meridiem coram commissariis supra nominatis comparuit personaliter illustrissimus dñus Henricus Comes de Clarendon et tunc et ibidem præsentavit præ. rever. patr. cōmissariis literas commissionales regias eis (inter alios) directas supplicando, quatenus onus executionis literarum commissionalium hujusmodi in se assumere, et juxta vim, tenorem et effectum earundem, in dicto consecrationis negotio decernere dignarentur. Quibus quidem literis commissionalibus de mandato prædictorum commissariorum per me publicè visis, lectis, et diu ponderatis, commissarii prædicti, ob reverentiam et debitum honorem dicto illustr^mo^ principi et domino nostro acceptarunt in se onus literarum prædictarum hujusmodi decreverunt procedendum fore juxta vim, formam et effectum earundem. Tunc commissarii prædicti capellam sive oratorium prædictum ingredientes ubi omnia ordine suo parata erant et instructa, reverendus in Christo pater, Gulielmus episcopus Norvicensis preces continuo clara voce recitabat. Quibus peractis, munus consecrationis reverendi Thomæ Wagstaffe Artium Mag^ri^ in Episcopum suffraganeum et pastorem Ecclesiarum de Ipswich, in comitatu Suffociæ, præstito prius per eum (spontaniè) juramento de agnoscendo regiam supremam potestatem in causis ecclesiasticis et temporalibus ac de renunciando omni et omnimodæ jurisdictioni, potestati et authoritati foraneis, juxta vim, formam et effectum statuti parliamenti hujus inclyti regni Angliæ in eâ parte editi et provisi, quam de reverentia et debita obedientia reverendissimo domino Cantuariæ Archiepiscopo legitimè et canonicè intranti adhibendo. Observandis insuper et adhibendis juxta modum et formam descriptam in libro intitulo The form and manner of making and consecrating Priests and Deacons etc. realiter impendebant. Ipsumque Thomam Wagstaffe ordinarunt in Episcopum suffraganeum de

The 'public act' is Overall's Convocation Book, and Wagstaffe remarks appositely: 'I presume there is not one single person but what had taken the oath, either before the publication of the Convocation Book or without any respect to it.' He concludes his postscript in answer to Sherlock:

I believe, should any man at that time [when Sherlock wrote 'The Case of Resistance'] have but asked him the Question, concerning his present Opinions and Practices, he would have returned such an Answer as Hazael gave to Elisha ['Is thy servant a dog, that he should do this great thing?'] But Hazael afterwards changed his mind and so has the Doctor [p. 48].

The 'Letter out of Suffolk to a Friend in London, giving some Account of the last sickness and death of Dr. William Sancroft, late Archbishop of Canterbury,' shows that Wagstaffe had a heart as well as a head. It bears every trace of his having felt what he wrote:

Here [he says] you have before you a glorious confessor, here you have your Holy Archbishop, making a safe Passage through Storms and Tempests, and carrying his integrity of Conscience undefiled to the Grave (p. 6).

We had a most reverend Archbishop in Fresingfield, when there was none at Lambeth, nor nothing like it [p. 26].

Wagstaffe's works were mostly pamphlets, though some of them very lengthy pamphlets. A full list of them will be found in the article on him in the 'Dictionary of National Biography,' written by his successor at

Ipswich prædict. in præsentia mei Roberti Duglas, not^{rii} Pub^{ci}, præsentibus etiam tunc et ibidem Honoratissimo Domino Henrico Comite de Clarendon, Georgio Hickes sacræ the. pro.

(Signatures)

Gulielmus Norvic. L.S. Fran. Eliensis. L.S. Thos. Petriburgensis. L.S.

(Witnesses)

Clarendon.
Georgius Hickes

St. Margaret Pattens, who is an expert in all Nonjuring matters. Wagstaffe appears to have led a very quiet, domesticated life. He left behind him a large family, one of whom, his second son, Thomas, who was at least the equal of his father in abilities and attainments, will come before us in connection with the later Nonjurors.

On the death of Wagstaffe, October 17, 1712, all the deprived Fathers being now dead, there was only one bishop of the 'faithful remnant' left. If, then, the Nonjuring succession was to be kept up, there was no time to be lost. One of the objections to the consecrations of Hickes and Wagstaffe was that they might well have been postponed, as there was quite a sufficient number of bishops still living, and likely to live, to ordain the few who were likely to seek ordination. But now there was only Dr. Hickes remaining, and he an invalid. If he were to die suddenly the society would be virtually dissolved, for, according to the principles of the Nonjurors, a Church without a bishop would be no Church at all. And as Hickes also held in the most uncompromising form the view that a Church governed by usurping bishops (as he still deemed those of the Established Church to be) was no Church at all, he was conscientiously bound to have recourse to extreme measures, if necessary, to avert the catastrophe. He was left stranded, so far as England was concerned; but there was the sister Church of Scotland, and there were two bishops of that Church ready at hand, who lived in London and identified themselves in every way with the English Nonjurors. Three bishops were necessary for a canonical consecration, so Hickes called in the aid of Bishops Archibald Campbell and James Gadderar, and on the Ascension Day, June 3, 1713, with their assistance, in his own oratory in Scroop's Court (afterwards Union Court), in the parish of St. Andrew's,

Holborn, consecrated Nathanael Spinckes, Jeremy Collier, and Samuel Hawes to be 'bishops at large,'[1] without any titular sees like those of Thetford and Ipswich, from which he and Wagstaffe had taken their titles, and without any reference to the Suffragan Bishops Act of Henry VIII. The consecrations were witnessed by 'Heneage, 4th Earl of Winchilsea, and Henry Gandy.'

The question is of so great importance in a history of the Nonjurors that it will be best to give in the text what the consecrators themselves said about it. The exordium of the 'Apographum' of Collier's consecration may be translated thus:

In the name of the Lord. Amen.

We, George Hickes, Catholic Bishop of the English Church and Suffragan of Thetford, Archibald Campbell, and James Gadderar, Catholic Bishops of the Scottish Church (depending on the fear of God) knowing that all the Catholic Bishops of the English Church except the aforesaid George Hickes have fallen asleep in the Lord—mindful both of the office committed to us by the Lord and also of the uncertainty of human life, and desiring to provide for the welfare of the English by perpetuating in a direct line that sacred, Catholic untainted succession of faithful, &c.

The same form, *mutatis mutandis*, was used in the 'Apographa' of Hawes and Spinckes, and in later consecrations.

Two questions naturally arise with regard to these consecrations: (1) What jurisdiction had two bishops of the Scotch Church in the Province of Canterbury? (2) What authority had 'the Suffragan Bishop of Thetford' (as Hickes is expressly called in the 'Apographum') when his diocesan was dead? Curiously enough, the first question does not appear to have been raised at the time, though it has naturally been raised by later historians.

[1] 'Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Episcopi Catholici.'

But the latter was boldly grappled with by the Nonjurors. Indeed, it could hardly fail to be, because it was one of the very questions raised by Dodwell in his 'Case in View' (1705) and his 'Case in View, now in fact' (1709). Dodwell had been a great name among the Nonjurors, and they were bound to justify themselves against the objections he had raised by anticipation. It was argued, then, '[1] that a Suffragan Bishop did not act purely by the authority of his Diocesan but by the authority of the whole College of Bishops, that after the Diocesan's death, when the district devolved to the College of Bishops, he had an equal right to act in his suffragan see under them, as he had before, it being committed to his care by them as well as by the Diocesan, as a curate by the Bishop as well as by the Vicar: [2] That a Suffragan Bishop's power was not limited by his Diocesan's, so as that he could not act duly in his Suffragan See, but *durante bene placito* of the Diocesan; for that it would be less, and more precarious than that of a Vicar, which cannot be supposed; but, if it *was* limited by his life as to the rest of his Diocese, yet after his death, it could be no longer so limited; the Suffragan Bishop shared with his Colleagues in the whole vacancy; [3] and so long as the Diocesan see was vacant, he had a right to exercise his episcopal powers in the whole Diocese, he being before appointed a Coadjutor in that Diocese by the College, and that right must continue in him till the Catholic College (of which he was one) constituted a new Diocesan: That all Bishops are equal with respect to their Consecration: That supposing a Suffragan Bishop was no longer the Diocesan's Suffragan than during the time limited by the Commission given by the Diocesan, yet he was a Catholic Bishop still, and a member of the Episcopal College as much as any: That as the Suffragan Bishop was a Bishop at large,

equal to one of the Apostles being only such, in the Unity of the Episcopal College he had a just share in the right and government of all vacancies that happen by death, schism, or heresy, by Popish superstitious worship, or any other practical desertion of the Catholic Unity and Communion.'[1]

Whatever may be thought of such defences of the new consecrations, it cannot be denied that the men selected for consecration were worthy of their new office. Two out of the three were really distinguished men, who would have been an honour to the episcopate in any age; in point both of abilities, attainments, and achievements, and also of piety and earnestness, they were the equals of any two bishops in the Established Church that could be named. The third is not so well known, but all that we hear of him is to his credit. It was no enviable post to which they were appointed; it brought them no emolument whatever, and not even barren honour, for they were not addressed or spoken of, even by their friends, by their titles, but simply as Mr. Collier, Mr. Spinckes, and Mr. Hawes; they had not even the satisfaction of feeling that they were pleasing their (temporal) master 'over the water,' for the Chevalier distinctly disapproved of the new consecrations. But let us turn to their history.

Jeremy Collier (1650–1726) is a man whose merits have been very generally recognised. Even Lord Macaulay, who, as was natural in the panegyrist of William III., wholly disapproved of the Nonjurors' attitude, and who differed from Collier as widely as possible on all points of theology, yet generously owns that 'he was in the full force of the words, a good man'; and that 'he was also

[1] See a pamphlet or volume (it fills nearly 200 pages) entitled *Mr. Dodwell's Case in View thoroughly considered, or, The Case of Lay Deprivations and Independency of the Church (in Spirituals) set in a true light*, by a Presbyter of the Church of England.

a man of eminent abilities, a great master of sarcasm, a great master of rhetoric.'[1] Dr. Johnson, who, though he loved to talk Jacobitism, was strongly prejudiced against the Nonjurors, praises Collier's 'religious zeal and honest indignation';[2] and, in our own time, Dr. Hunt, who has quite as little sympathy with the Nonjurors generally as either Lord Macaulay or Dr. Johnson, bears his testimony to 'the genuine sincerity of Collier's mind.'[3]

Collier is a very notable illustration of the remark made in a previous page, that the Nonjurors devoted their abilities and attainments not exclusively to the Nonjuring cause, but to the interests of religion, morality, and learning generally. He is far better known as the courageous and successful purifier of the stage, when it sorely needed purifying, the champion of that too lightly regarded type of English clergyman, the domestic chaplain, more numerous in his time than in ours, and as the industrious ecclesiastical historian when ecclesiastical historians were rare,[4] than as a Nonjuring bishop.

Of his early life we have an account from his own pen; for there is little, if any, doubt that the notice of him in the 'Biographia Britannica' was in its early part written by himself. From it we learn that he was the son of Jeremy Collier, who was master for some time of the free school at Ipswich; that he was born at Stow Qui, or Quin, in Cambridgeshire, where his mother's family 'possessed considerable interest'; that he was educated under his father, and went in 1669 as 'a poor

[1] *History of England*, ch. xiv. (vol. ii. p. 106). Lord Macaulay also gives a vivid sketch of Collier in his brilliant essay on 'The Comic Dramatists of the Restoration.'

[2] *Lives of the Poets*, ii. 191: 'Congreve.'

[3] *Religious Thought in England*, ii. 81 (ch. vii.).

[4] 'We have only two historians of our National Church,' said Bishop Warburton, 'Collier, the Nonjuror, and Fuller, the Jester,' as if a Nonjuror and a Jester stood about on the same level of absurdity.

scholar' to Caius College, Cambridge; that having taken his degree he was ordained deacon in 1676 by the Bishop of Ely (Dr. Gunning), and priest in 1677 by the Bishop of London (Dr. Compton); that he then 'officiated for some time at the Countess Dowager of Dorset's, at Knowle in Kent'—(an interesting episode, for it shows us that the champion of domestic chaplains had been a domestic chaplain himself)—'from whence he removed to a small rectory at Ampton, near St. Edmund's Bury, in Suffolk'; that 'after he had held this benefice six years he resigned it, and came to reside in London in 1685, and was some little time after made lecturer at Gray's Inn; but the Revolution coming on the public exercise of his function became impracticable.' This last clause, however, does not mean that Collier was laid on the shelf; on the contrary, he became after, and in consequence of the Revolution, far more of a public man than ever. With characteristic boldness he at once rushed into the fray; and it was he who made 'the first attack upon the principles of the Revolution,'[1] with that formidable instrument, his pen. It came in the form of a short tract, entitled 'The Desertion Discussed in a Letter to a Country Gentleman, 1689.' Short as the attack was, it was very telling; for Collier's clear and logical mind perceived at once that the whole question hinged upon the matter in discussion. If King James had really deserted his subjects they must of course shift for themselves as best they could, and small blame could attach to them for submitting to a ruler who, at any rate, would remain at the helm of government. But Collier utterly denied the fact of the desertion—in other words, the major premiss of the argument; and he followed up his pamphlet by others of a like tendency; the result of it all was that he

[1] Lathbury, *History of the Nonjurors*, p. 113.

was imprisoned in Newgate for six months, and then released without being brought to trial. His imprisonment did not in the least check his activity in opposing the Revolution settlement; and in 1692, when it was reported that he and another Nonjuring clergyman named Newton[1] had gone to Romney Marsh with a view to holding communication with the King over the water, they were both arrested and imprisoned in the Gate House. As no evidence could be found against them they were admitted to bail; but Collier's sensitive conscience made him fear that by giving bail he would be recognising an authority which he considered unlawful, so he voluntarily gave himself up, and was again imprisoned for a short time. He employed that time in writing a defence of his conduct in a tract dated 'From the King's Bench, 1692,' and bearing the suggestive title, 'The Case of Giving Bail to a Pretended Authority Examined.' He followed this up with 'A Letter to Sir J. Holt,' the Chief Justice, to whom he had surrendered himself. He was soon released from prison at the intercession of his friends.

But in 1696 he involved himself in more serious trouble; in conjunction with two other Nonjuring clergymen, Mr. Cook and Mr. Snatt,[2] he attended to the scaffold Sir William Parkyns and Sir John Friend, who had been condemned to death for their supposed complicity in a plot to assassinate William III., and publicly absolved Sir William with the imposition of hands. This proceeding not unnaturally aroused the greatest indignation. The Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Tenison) and eleven of his suffragans who happened to be in London published a paper condemning it in the strongest terms. Collier's part in the matter cannot be better described than in his own words:

[1] George Newton, rector of Cheadle and vicar of Prestbury?

[2] Shadrach Cook, Lecturer of Islington [?]. William Snatt, Prebendary of Chichester and vicar of Cuckfield.

Sir William Parkins (whom I had not seen for four or five years) after his Tryal, desired me to come to him in order to his Preparation for another world. I accordingly visited him in Newgate, as I thought myself obliged by my character to do. I had [at?] first two days liberty of conversing with him in private. Afterwards I was not permitted to speak or pray with him alone, a keeper being always present. At last even this Permission was recalled, so that I could never see him from Wednesday, April 1, till Friday at the place of execution. Sir William being under expectation of death from the time of his sentence had given me the State of his Conscience, and therefore desired the solemn Absolution of the Church might be pronounced by me to him the last day. And understanding I was refused admittance on Friday morning, he sent word that he would gladly see me at the place of execution. I went there, and gave him the Absolution he requested, it being impracticable for me to do it elsewhere. This Office I performed word for word, as it stands in the Visitation of the Sick. And now where lies the great crime of all this? When a man has declared his sorrow for all the faults and miscarriages of his life, and qualified himself for the privilege of Absolution, with what justice can it be denied him? Ought not dying persons to be supported in their last agonies, and pass into the other world with all the advantage the Church can give them? I am surprised, so regular a proceeding as this should give so much offence and make so much noise as I perceive it has done. Some people I understand are displeased at the Office being performed with the Imposition of Hands. Now this is not only an innocent, but an ancient ceremony of Absolution. [He then proves it.] Others think it a strange presumption to admit a Person charged with so high a crime, to the benefit of Absolution. With submission this is concluding a great deal too fast. Are all people damned that are cast in a capital Indictment? If so, to what purpose are they visited by Divines? Why are they exhorted to repentance, and have time allowed them to fit them for death? But if they may be acquitted hereafter, notwithstanding their condemnation here; if they be recovered by recollection, by repentance and resignation, why should the Church refuse them her Pardon on earth, when she believes 'tis passed in Heaven? The Power of the Keys was given for this purpose, that the Ministers of God might bind or loose, as the disposition of the Person required. The latter I sincerely

believed to be Sir William's case. I judged him to have a full right to all the privileges of Communion. And therefore had I denied him Absolution upon his request I had failed in my duty, and gone against the authority both of the ancient, and of the English Church. I could not do it in private, or I should have done so.[1]

April 9, 1696. JER. COLLIER.

He published a Further Defence, dated April 21, 1696, in which he dwelt more at length on the ceremony of the Imposition of Hands, on which the bishops, rather foolishly, had laid special stress. Having referred to a similar incident which had occurred at the execution of Mr. Ashton in 1690, and remonstrated touchingly with the bishops on 'the unkind reflections and tragical language of the Declaration,' he concludes: 'However, their extraordinary usage has done me the honour of an opportunity to forgive them, which, I thank God, I heartily do.'

But this was not the last of it. He wrote a third paper, entitled 'A Reply to the Absolution of a Penitent according to the directions of the Church of England,' in which he answers the objection raised that 'Sir William own'd his being privy to the intended assassination.' This objection, in my opinion, was by far the gravest of all, and Collier does not appear to me to have answered it quite as clearly as he might have done. The absolution was given publicly, and there was no public confession of repentance. Collier pleaded, rightly enough, that the seal of confession was sacred; he also drew a perfectly right distinction between Church censures and civil punishments. But he does not dwell upon this latter point with that clearness and fulness with which Leslie, for instance, does in his 'Regale and Pontificate'; and I cannot see why he should not have insisted, in his deal-

[1] A Defence of the Absolution given to Sir William Parkins at the place of execution, April 3.

ings with Sir William, that, if the absolution was to be public, the confession of repentance must be public too. At any rate, there is no doubt that the whole incident did very great damage to the Nonjuring cause. It gave a disagreeable impression that the Nonjurors thought lightly of the detestable and thoroughly un-English crime of assassination. That Collier detested it from his heart, and never did, and never would, countenance it, is indubitable. But, unlike himself, he did not make this as clear as he should have done. He suffered severely for his indiscretion. While his colleagues, Cook and Snatt, after a short imprisonment in Newgate, were released, Collier, owing to his scruples about giving bail, absconded, and was outlawed; and an outlaw he remained to the end of his life. His outlawry indeed was ignored, and he was able to return to his ordinary avocations; but it was an unpleasant situation for any man to be in. He regularly officiated at the Nonjurors' Oratory in Broad Street, where, it is said, 'he was assisted by the Rev. Samuel Carte, father of the historian.'[1] But this must be a mistake. Samuel Carte, father of the historian, was a beneficed clergyman to the end of his long life, but he had two sons, Thomas and Samuel, both Nonjurors; and it was surely Samuel Carte the brother, not Samuel Carte the father, of the historian who assisted Collier.

After the death of Hickes, in 1715, Collier was beyond all question the most prominent man among the Nonjurors, and Hickes's mantle would, as a matter of course, have fallen upon him. But, alas! it was soon to be a divided family of which he was the natural head. Under any circumstances the prospects of the Nonjurors would probably have sunk with the sinking chances of the Stuart cause; but the decline was greatly accelerated by

[1] See *Notes and Queries* for October 26, 1850.

their internal disputes about the 'Usages.' It is probable that these disputes would never have arisen if Hickes's life had been spared; but, even if they had, the later Nonjurors regarded him with such absolute confidence that his word would have been law with them, and he might have settled the matter as he pleased. At the same time, it is hardly fair to lay the whole blame of the division upon Collier, and still less fair to hint, as was not obscurely hinted by his opponents, that it was Collier's ambition to hold the first place which originated the unhappy controversy. He *did* hold the first place; he was in every way Hickes's proper successor as Metropolitan, so to speak, of the Nonjurors; and when he signed himself, as we shall find he afterwards did, 'Primus Anglo-Britanniæ Episcopus,' he only claimed what from the Nonjurors' point of view was his due. To the outer world he was, perhaps, even better known than Hickes had been, and was certainly more regarded by that world. Outsiders, who have scarcely anything but blame for Hickes, have scarcely anything but praise for Collier. But, looking at the matter from the inside, the whole aspect is changed. The Nonjurors never had, and probably under no circumstances would have had, the same reverence for Collier that they had for Hickes. Of course the antecedents of the two might make a difference. The man who had held a deanery and refused a bishopric in the pre-Revolution Church, and who had been on the most intimate terms with the deprived Fathers themselves, would naturally have more weight than one who was not thus connected with the past. But, apart from this, Hickes seems to have had, what Collier had not, the art of governing men. The Nonjurors had no objection to the phrase, which was often used, 'The Communion of Dr. Hickes,' but they resented

the idea of being 'The Communion of Mr. Collier.' Much more will have to be said about Collier both in connection with the 'Usages' and with the 'Literature of the Nonjurors.' At present it is enough to say that it was an honour to the Nonjurors, whether they appreciated it or not, to have such a man as Jeremy Collier among their bishops. The only man who could in any way have competed with him for 'the Primacy' was another of the bishops who was consecrated with him.

Nathanael Spinckes (1653–1727) has been described by a high authority as 'in no way inferior to Collier in learning or ability.'[1] Perhaps that is putting the case rather strongly; at any rate he was not so brilliant a writer. But the fact is, one cannot compare the two men, for they belonged to different types of mind. There were always two types among the Nonjurors, one of which was represented by Ken, Kettlewell, and Law, the other by Hickes, Collier, and Leslie; and Spinckes belonged to the former type. That peculiar beauty of character which we term 'saintliness' was their leading feature, and it was conspicuous in Spinckes. He was essentially a learned man, and a man of varied accomplishments, and he was by no means disinclined to enter the lists of controversy. He wrote five separate treatises on the Roman Controversy of a strongly anti-Roman character;[2] one against the French Prophets, a set of fanatics who made a great sensation in England in the early part of the eighteenth century; one against that very able latitudinarian, Benjamin Hoadly, and several against 'the Usagers.' He was an accomplished linguist, being a proficient in Greek, Latin, Anglo-Saxon, and French, and having some knowledge of the Oriental languages.

[1] Lathbury, *History of the Nonjurors*, p. 365.
[2] See Hearne's *Collections* (Oxf. Hist. Soc.), i. 27, 30.

His brother Nonjurors had so great confidence in him as a Grecian, that they engaged him to translate into Greek the proposals of union which they sent to the Greek Church; and he had so high a reputation for general knowledge that he is said to have been called in to assist in the writing or editing of such different kinds of works as Grabe's 'Septuagint,' Newcourt's 'Repertorium,' Laurence Howell's 'Synopsis Canonum,' Archbishop Potter's 'Clemens Alexandrinus,' and Walker's 'Sufferings of the Clergy.' But he was even better known by his contemporaries for his goodness than for his erudition, and he is chiefly remembered by posterity for his devotional works, which will be noticed in their proper place. Spinckes was always, and rightly, regarded as one of the chief saints of the Nonjuring community. When that rather worldly (to put it mildly) sympathiser with the Nonjurors, Samuel Pepys, applied to Robert Nelson to recommend him a spiritual guide from among the Nonjuring clergy, Nelson selected Spinckes, thinking probably that a very spiritually minded man was best fitted to deal with such a case. Dr. Hickes, with whom he was brought into very close relationship when the two were fellow chaplains to the Duke of Lauderdale, had the highest opinion of him. After one of the accounts of Spinckes's consecration it is added, 'and it was known to be Dr. Hickes' declared and repeated judgment that no man understood Church discipline better, or was better qualified to be a Church Governor than Mr. Spinckes.'[1] This is borne out by the warm testimony which Hickes bears to Spinckes's merits in the Preface to his 'Thesaurus.' Mr. Lathbury also tells us that 'it has been remarked in reference to his consecration as a bishop, "happy would

[1] See 'Life of Nathanael Spinckes,' prefixed to *The Sick Man Visited*, 6th edit., 1775, p. xxiii.

it have been for any diocese had he been legally appointed to it."'[1] His career before the Revolution had been that of the ordinary English clergyman. He was born at Castor, in North Hants, where his father was rector, and educated under a neighbouring rector, Samuel Morton, of Haddon, until he went to Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1670; in 1673 he migrated to Jesus, where he was elected scholar on the Rustat foundation. Having received Holy Orders, he acted as chaplain, first to Sir Richard Edgecombe at Mount Edgecombe, and then to the Duke of Lauderdale at Petersham. On the duke's death in 1682, he became curate and lecturer at St. Stephen's, Walbrook; in 1685 he was presented by the Dean and Chapter of Peterborough to the rectory of Peakirk-cum-Glinton, where he married; and in 1687 he became a prebendary and rector of St. Martin's at Salisbury. Of course he lost all his preferments when he refused the oaths, and he was for a time in straitened circumstances. He is, like Wagstaffe, an instance of a Nonjuror who had recourse to literary activity, when practical activity was denied him. He published nothing before the Revolution, but after that event his pen was very busy until his death. He bore an active part in Kettlewell's scheme for the relief of the distressed clergy, was brought with the rest before the Privy Council, and was afterwards chiefly entrusted with the management of the fund. John Kettlewell and he were kindred spirits, and it is no wonder that they were friends to the last, when they received the Holy Communion together at Kettlewell's deathbed; and Spinckes was at least equally intimate with Hickes. Robert Nelson was also his friend, and bequeathed him a hundred pounds. Beneath his portrait inserted in the fourth edition of his 'Sick Man Visited' is this inscrip-

[1] *History of the Nonjurors*, p. 365.

tion: 'The Rev. Mr. Spinckes. This very eminent divine was venerable of aspect, orthodox in truth, his adversaries being judges. He had uncommon learning and superior judgment. His patience was great, his self-denial greater, his charity still greater. His temper, sweet and unmovable beyond comparison.' The latter part of this description is amply borne out by facts. It is said that he never made a personal enemy. Epitaphs are not always to be trusted; but the following elegant epitaph on Spinckes 'in the burial-ground of St. Faith's on the north side of St. Paul's,' where he was interred, really seems to say no more than the truth:

Depositum
Viri plane reverendi
Nathanaelis Spinckes, A.M.
Ortu Northamptoniensis
Academia Cantabrigiensis
Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Pr. dignissimi,
Amicis, patriæ, erudito orbi,
XVIII. Jul. MDCCXXVII.
Abrepti.
Erat ille ingenio miti,
Vultu placidissimo:
Rem Christianam
Scriptis tuebatur luculentis,
Luculentiori ornabat exemplo.
Crederes antiquorum Patrum
Et mores et doctrinam
In nostrum Theologum,
Nupero quasi miraculo,
Transfusos.
Moritur
Anno ætatis Septuagesimo Quarto,
Iniqua fortuna non diuturnior
Sed major.
Proximam huic terram occupat Dorothea conjux.

His wife survived him only seven days. He took, as we shall find, a leading part in the 'Usages' controversy,

which elicited much hot feeling and many hot words; but there was not a word written by Spinckes which was unworthy of a Christian gentleman; and though much strong language was written about others, I cannot find one word reflecting upon Spinckes.

Of the third bishop, who was consecrated in 1713, it is not surprising that little is known. From the nature of their position the Nonjurors were doomed to obscurity. Even Hickes, Collier, and Spinckes are not nearly so well known as from their talents and attainments they would have been if they had taken the oaths. And the quiet sufferers for conscience' sake were sure not to attract, as they probably would not desire, the notice of their fellow-men.

Samuel Hawes (d. 1722) belonged to this class. He graduated at Trinity College, Oxford (B.A. 1672, M.A. 1676), and in 1686 became rector of Braybrooke, near Market Harborough, and domestic chaplain to Lord Griffin of Braybrooke, succeeding as rector a distinguished man, Dr. John Mapletoft. Through the kindness of the present rector of Braybrooke (the Rev. J. Ridgway Hakewill) I have received a letter which, though mainly of local interest, throws some light upon the life and mind of Mr. Hawes, and also an extract from Mr. Hawes's will so far as it relates to Braybrooke. The letter is from a Mr. Whyles to 'Rev. Mr. Chapman, Rector of Braybrooke,' and runs thus:

Welsbourne: Nov. 20, 1721.

S^{r},—You may too justly suspect y^{t} I had forgot my promise to you in enquiring of Mr. Hawes ab^{t} the Rights of y^{r} Living since you have heard nothing from me in so long a time. M^{r}. Hawes was removed from his House in Town & gone down with L^{d} Winchelsea to live wth him in Kent & I knew not 'till very lately how to write to him, w^{ch} I did ab^{t} a Month agoe & on Friday last I rec^{d} the following Answer from him bearing date the 9th Inst. relating to your affair w^{ch} I have here transcribed.

'As to my living of Braybrooke I am fully satisfy'd y^{t} the

Rect^{r} does not enjoy w^{t} of Right belongeth to him, nor hath since the Reformation. For that Estate belonging to a Griffin who was Attorney Geñal at y^{e} Reformation & had a vast Estate. He swallow'd up the Rectory, & made the Church a Stipendiary Cure, upon very low Terms, & so it continued 'till Sir Edward Griffin's time, who was my L^{ds} Father. But in the Reign of Kg Charles 1st when fav^{r} was shew'd to Church men AB^{p} Laud being ready to assist, one Hill . . . took y^{e} Title of the Crown upon y^{e} Lapse & sued Sir Ed. Griffin for the Tythes and recovered them. . . . D$^{r.}$ Mapletoft my iñediate predecessor who had a good Temporal Estate never resided, but went on as I think his Predecessor one D$^{r.}$ Crawford a Scotchman did & I followed the example of D$^{r.}$ Mapletoft set me, because I was earnestly pressed to continue in the family & so never resided. However I began to search as soon as I could get opportunity, but found y^{t} all the Pap^{rs} relating to y^{t} Suite ab^{t} y^{e} Tythes & Glebe were lost, in short, the Revolution coming on I was thrown out & soe an end put to all my endeav^{rs}. M$^{r.}$ Chapman having purchas'd y^{e} Advowson or Patronage of the church His interest will encourage him to endeav^{r} to recover his dues & I wish him good luck tho' I can do him no service.'

The following is an extract from the Braybrooke Register:

1722. A copy of the Rev. M$^{r.}$ Sam^{l} Hawes last will sent to me by His Executor M$^{r.}$ Henry Gandy of Scroop Court in Holbourn London as far it concerns his Legacy to y^{e} Parish of Braybrooke in Northtonshire.

'Item I (Samuel Hawes of Eastwell in Kent) Give to y^{e} Parish of Braybrooke in y^{e} County of Northton & diocess of Peterborough of which in right I am Parson & R^{r} the Sum of Fifty Pounds to be added to y^{e} fifty pounds given to y^{e} said Parish by my Predecess^{r} the Revñd D$^{r.}$ Mapletoft to be put out at Interest and y^{e} Interest to be for & towards y^{e} maintenance of a Person appointed by y^{e} Rector for y^{e} time being to teach y^{e} Poor Children of y^{e} said Parish to read & write & y^{e} Church Catechism.'

N.B. The Rev. M$^{r.}$ Sam^{l} Hawes above mentioned died in y^{e} year of our Lord 1722.

Attested by Rolt Chapman
Rector of Braybrooke.

This all tallies with what we gather from slight notices elsewhere, and is more illustrative of our subject than may at first sight appear. The 'house in town' agrees with a notice of the Nonjuring oratories in London; 'Mr. Hawkes'—evidently a misprint for Mr. Hawes, for there was no Nonjuring clergyman named Hawkes—'officiated for some time at his own house opposite S. James's Palace.'[1] His 'going down to live with Lord Winchelsea in Kent' is just what one would expect. Heneage Finch, fourth Earl of Winchilsea, the owner of Eastwell, was a well-known patron of the Nonjurors; he was present at the two next consecrations on St. Paul's Day, 1715–6, when Hawes was one of the consecrators, and would naturally like to have a Nonjuring clergyman in residence at Eastwell. 'Mr. Henry Gandy' had been consecrated bishop by Hawes himself in 1715–6, took the same line as he did in the 'Usages' controversy, and was, in short, just the person one would expect to be his executor. But far more important than these coincidences are the illustrations afforded of the attitude of the Nonjurors generally. It will be observed that though Hawes claims to be 'in right the Parson and Rector' of Braybrooke, he is not only perfectly friendly with the incumbent *de facto*, but ready to help him in every way, gives him all the information he can in regard to the rights of the living, wishes him 'good luck' in his endeavours to establish those rights, and in his will puts the appointment of the teacher who is to profit by the little sum he leaves entirely in his hands, or that of the rector for the time being. Another Nonjuror, William Law, acted on the same principle in regard to his much larger benefactions to King's Cliffe. And in both cases the object of the bene-

[1] See a very interesting paper on the Oratories of the Nonjurors in *Notes and Queries* for October 26, 1850.

factors was to help the Church. The children at Braybrooke were to be taught, not some new formulary of the Nonjurors, but the old Church Catechism. In fact, it is another instance of the fact that the Nonjurors meant to be thoroughly loyal to the Church of England, and that if they were at variance with those who had the upper hand in it, the reason was that they verily believed those men were *not* loyal to it. Therefore I cannot think that such terms as 'The Nonjuring Schism' or 'The Nonjuring Separation' are accurate; they give people a totally wrong impression; it was at most a temporary alienation which was sure to right itself in time. But to return to Mr. Hawes. I write 'Mr.' advisedly, for it will be observed that no mention of the word 'Bishop' occurs; he never claims the title himself, and it is never given him.

The only writing which I can identify for a certainty as the work of Hawes is a paper among the Rawlinson MSS. entitled, 'Considerations what a Christian is to do who goes into a Country or Place where the Clergy is Unwarrantable or the Worship Corrupt, or both.' He founds his remarks on the truth that 'a Christian is bound to believe in One Holy Catholic Church,' and expresses views of a very pronounced Church type. Then he argues against attendance at 'the immoral prayers,' and deals with the difficulty of Christians who think that they ought under any circumstances to attend *some* public worship.

> Some good people grow uneasy out of fear that they should live like Heathens, and as without God in the world, if they should not repair to some place of public worship. . . . But it is not living without God in the world, but clinging more firmly to him, and giving proof of greater reverence and regard to the Purity and Holiness of His Divine Nature. . . . Behold to obey is better than Sacrifice. . . . Elijah at the brook Cherith had no public worship. . . . Let good Christians, when they have no recourse to Lawful Assemblys where our Holy Worship

is offered up by a Warrantable Priesthood, repair to their closetts and there offer up such Prayers as are agreeable to Almighty God. And if they can, let them do it at the time of the Solemn Assembly.

Hawes seems to have been one of the many Nonjurors who placed themselves under the guidance of Dr. Hickes, for in one of the manuscript books belonging to the library of St. John's College, Cambridge, is 'A Letter from Mr. Dodwell to Mr. Hawes,' dated February 14, 170$\frac{4}{5}$, in which Dodwell argues elaborately against continuing the separation after the death or cession of the deprived Fathers. It is an answer to a letter from Hawes, and is signed 'Yours most affectionately,' so Hawes and Dodwell were evidently friends. Appended to the letter are 'Remarks by Bp. Hickes' answering, point by point, all Dodwell's arguments, which evidently convinced Hawes, who became a Nonjuror of the Hickes type.

Besides the inference to be drawn from his will there are other indications that Hawes was not reduced to the same straits to which many of the Nonjurors were. He could afford to spend money on books; for the few incidental notices of him in Hearne's 'Collections' are in connection with book-buying; in fact, he collected a rather valuable library, which was sold in 1722 immediately after his death. The printed catalogue is still extant; it is entitled 'Bibliotheca Reverendi Doctique Viri *Samuelis Hawes*, nuper defuncti'; the books in it are in Greek, Latin, English, French, Italian, and Spanish, so Hawes was probably, like many of the Nonjurors, a good linguist.

After the death of Dr. Hickes at the close of 1715 it was thought necessary to consecrate two new bishops. 'On S. Paul's Day, 1715–6, Dr. T. Brett and Mr. H. Gandy, M.A., were consecrated in Mr. Gandy's Chapell

by Mr. Collier, Hawes, Spinckes, Campbell and Gadderar.' Both were able men, and the former a very distinguished one, to be ranked on the same level with Hickes, Collier, and Spinckes.

Thomas Brett (1667–1743) differed in several respects, both in his circumstances and his career, from most of the Nonjurors. Like Wagstaffe he seems to have belonged to what would now be called 'a county family.' At any rate, the Bretts had long been settled at Wye, in Kent, but whether as 'lesser gentry' or 'county magnates' is not clear. His father, also Thomas Brett, was probably in affluent circumstances, for he pulled down the ancestral house and built a new one which he called Spring Grove, a name which was henceforth associated with several generations of Bretts. His mother, born Lætitia Boys, also belonged to a family of substance at Betteshanger, near Sandwich. The future bishop was educated at Wye Grammar School until his entrance as a pensioner, in 1684, at Queens' College, Cambridge; his father removed him for a time on account of his extravagance, but he soon returned, and migrated to Corpus Christi in 1689. He was ordained deacon in 1690 and became curate of Folkestone. He had no difficulty about taking the oaths, for he inherited the Whig traditions of his family; and it was not until he left Folkestone and went as lecturer to Islington that any change in his views began; there, under the influence of the vicar of Islington, Mr. Gery, he became a Tory and a High Churchman, though of course not as yet with any tendency to become a Nonjuror, because the man who influenced him himself held a benefice in the 'Revolution Church.' On the death of his father, Brett was persuaded by his mother to return to Spring Grove, whence he at first served the church of Great Chart, and then became curate of Wye,

living no doubt in his own house at Spring Grove in the parish. He had now married the daughter of Sir Nicholas Toke, and this bound him still more closely to the county. On the death of his mother's brother he succeeded his uncle in the family living of Betteshanger; and in 1705 Archbishop Tenison gave him the living of Ruckinge, a plain proof that his new principles were not yet pronounced, or, at any rate, known, for Tenison would never have promoted an advanced High Churchman. He was, however, tending in that direction, probably to the alarm of his family; for his kinsman, Chief Baron Gilbert, strove to bring him back to the family principles; but the effect was the exact opposite of what was intended; and one can readily understand that the sort of arguments which a Whig lawyer would use would not be likely to convince a man who was certainly influenced by High Church doctrines. Some years before this Brett had found the Abjuration Oath, which was a stumbling-block to many, a hard dose to swallow, but he managed to swallow it; and as late as 1710, so far from intending to join the Nonjurors, he actually traversed their position in his work on Church Government. He was, however, on the verge of a change; and those who can read between the lines may detect traces of it even in this his latest utterance as a complier. The Sacheverell trial clinched the matter, and he determined that he would never take the oaths again. In 1711 he preached a sermon 'On the Remission of Sins,' in which the High Church doctrine of priestly authority was advocated in the strongest terms; it created a great sensation, and was only just saved from the censure of Convocation by the efforts of Dr. Atterbury, who was then Prolocutor.

When George I. came to the throne, and an Act of Parliament in 1715 obliged all persons to take the oaths

afresh, Brett declined to do so, and lost his livings. He did not, however, join the Nonjurors at once, but remained in lay communion with the Established Church. Then Dr. Hickes, who was always on the alert to make converts, commissioned Archibald Campbell to write and remonstrate with him on his inconsistency. He did not yield at once; he first 'read Dodwell'—that is, no doubt, the 'Case in View' and the 'Case in Fact'—'on the point, but thought his arguments weak, so he resolved to surrender himself to Hickes, and, upon a penitential confession, was received into his communion, July 1, 1715; Hickes henceforward had great influence over him.' This is the account of Nichols,[1] and Brett's own description agrees with it, except in the last clause. He tells us that 'he quitted the Public Communion and joined himself to the Communion of Bishop Hickes,' but adds that Hickes 'was ill when he received him to Communion,' and that 'it was the last time he saw him.'[2] Dates and facts, of course, bear out Brett's account. In July 1715 Hickes was sealed for death, and before the year closed he died. But Nichols is perfectly right in saying that Hickes 'had great influence over him'; that influence commenced before he became a Nonjuror, and, as a Nonjuror, he certainly strove to follow the course which he thought Hickes would have taken. He refers to him often, and always with the deepest reverence, both in the works which he wrote before and also in those which he wrote after he had joined 'the communion of Bishop Hickes.'

Brett had, happily, some little property of his own to fall back upon, so he was not reduced to straits. He still lived in his own house at Spring Grove, and ministered every Sunday to a little congregation which assembled

[1] *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, i. 407–9.
[2] See Brett's Preface to his *Collection of Liturgies*.

there, until he was presented at the Assizes for keeping a conventicle. The passing of an Act of Indemnity enabled him to continue his ministrations, but he thought it safer to vary the place of meeting, so he used to go sometimes to Canterbury, sometimes to Faversham, where part of his congregation lived. He was still, however, exposed to annoyances; when he visited a sick person, who was, no doubt, one of his congregation, at Faversham, the parish priest complained to Brett's old friend and patron Archbishop Tenison, as diocesan; and Tenison told Brett that 'if he heard any more complaints he should be obliged to lay them before the King and Council.'[1] In 1729 he obtained leave of the vicar of Morton to perform the Burial Service in his church, but Lord Townshend complained to the archbishop, who 'ordered the Archdeacon to reprove the Vicar of Morton.' As the utmost laxity then prevailed about the conduct of Church services, one can hardly help thinking of the line:

Dat veniam corvis, vexat censura columbas.

Brett was twitted by both Jurors and Nonjurors with his change of opinions. He had, as we have seen, actually written against the Nonjurors as late as 1710; but, instead of ignoring the past, he took the wiser and manlier course of publicly owning that he had been mistaken. In a postscript to the Introduction of his very able treatise on 'The Independency of the Church upon the State as to its Own Spiritual Powers,' published in 1717, he writes:

Whereas, in the Second Edition of a Book called 'An Account of Church Government, &c.,' which I published in the year 1710, I have, Page 38 &c. charged the *Nonjurors* with *Conventicling* and *Schism*; I do here, in the Face of the World, recall that charge, *Retracting* (as I then declared *I should be ready to do upon better Information*) whatever I have there, or

[1] Nichols, *ut supra*.

anywhere else, laid down or asserted in Opposition to my present Practice, or in Vindication of that Compliance to which I then thought it my duty to submit: Referring all those who have been misguided by the Erroneous Arguments made use upon that Occasion to this small Treatise of the *Independency of the Church*; and another I have lately published entituled 'Dr. Bennet's *Concessions to the Nonjurors*.' In which they will find the Reasons and Grounds of that Accusation sufficiently answered & confuted, and the *Nonjurors* vindicated from the Imputation of Schism. And to this End, I earnestly entreat them to give them both an impartial Reading.

In short, he appealed from Philip drunk to Philip sober, as Dr. Sherlock did when he recanted in his 'Case of Allegiance' what he had written in his 'Case of Resistance.' I do not doubt the sincerity of either; but there is this serious difference between them: that Sherlock had everything to gain, Brett everything to lose by recanting.

The National Church could ill afford to lose such men as Dr. Brett, whose reading and tastes supplied just what was so grievously lacking in the eighteenth century. There was no lack then of great divines; in fact, it may be doubted whether there ever was a time when the general truths of Christianity were more powerfully defended; but liturgical knowledge was not one of its strong points; indeed it was hardly regarded as a matter of study at all. Good Churchmen were content to praise 'our incomparable Liturgy' as they praised 'our happy Establishment in Church and State,' as if the last word had been said; lax Churchmen who were dissatisfied with the Prayer Book as it stood could only suggest modern innovations of their own. But Brett had really studied antiquity, especially the ancient liturgies; and his writings are authorities on the subject, even to the present day. He was, in my opinion, far and away the best authority in his own day, though he was not always

appreciated as such, even in his own little communion. It is rather amusing to read the opinion on the subject of Matthias Earbery, a very pronounced Nonjuror and Jacobite, who had known Brett 'when,' he says, 'you was a formal Jurant, and held a living in Romney Marsh,' and also afterwards, 'when you invited me over (I cannot say disputed me) into the Nonjurant Church, where your learnedship assured me only salvation was to be had.' Brett, it appears, had pleaded the high authority of Dr. Hickes, as sanctioning the study of Antiquity and especially the ancient liturgies. 'Peace,' replies Mr. Earbery, 'be to the memory of that great man! I could almost blush for Indignation to see a man of his learning harp upon a few ridiculous Liturgies and call them the Universal Practice of the Primitive Church.'[1] The 'few ridiculous Liturgies' were those bearing the not unhonoured names of St. Clement, St. James, St. Mark, St. John Chrysostom, St. Basil, &c., on which Brett had put forth a most valuable work this very year, 1720. For his pains on this and kindred subjects he was labelled a papist, and it was currently reported that he had actually gone over to the Roman fold. Whether it was worth his while indignantly to deny the rumour in print as he did,[2] perhaps we are hardly in a position to judge. It was a common charge against Nonjurors, the conclusion being arrived at by a kind of process of exhaustion. The eighteenth century mind could not be made to understand their position. They were not proper 'Church-of-England men' (a favourite expression of the day), for if they were they would be in favour of 'our

[1] *Reflections upon Modern Fanaticism. In two Letters to Dr. Brett, &c.*, by Matthias Earbery, Presbyter of the Church of England, 1720.

[2] See *Dr. Brett's Vindication of himself from the Calumnies Thrown upon him in some late Newspapers, wherein he is falsely charged with turning Papist. In a Letter to the Hon. Archibald Campbell, Esq.*, 1715.

happy establishment'; they were manifestly the very antipodes of Puritans; they were not Freethinkers; on the contrary, they wrote some of the most valuable works that appeared against Deists, Socinians, and other types of the class. Say what they would, they must be papists; there was nothing else for them. Perhaps their position is a little better understood now.

Brett was an accomplished controversialist, and had the rare advantage of never losing his temper, and, consequently, never being betrayed into the use of language in any way unbecoming a Christian and a gentleman. Like his brother Nonjuror, William Law, he generally pitted himself against strong antagonists. Daniel Waterland, Joseph Bingham, and Benjamin Hoadly were very formidable opponents. Brett measured swords with them all, and though it would be a bold thing to say that he vanquished them all, it may be said safely that they all found him a foeman worthy of their steel. Nor, papist though he was supposed to be, did he fail to express views which were strongly antagonistic to the Roman position. In Liturgiology, which may be regarded as his specialty, he distinctly declares his preference of the Greek and Eastern Liturgies to the Roman, on the ground that the former were more in accordance with the uses of the Primitive Church; and as late as 1733 he wrote three letters to John Cotton in favour of the Church of England as against the Church of Rome, fortifying his position by long quotations from Bramhall, one of the ablest champions our Church ever had. Thomas Bowdler, the descendant of a Nonjuring family, re-edited these in the middle of the nineteenth century under the title of 'Letters relating to the State of the Church of England with respect to the Roman Church both in her Doctrine and Practice by Dr. Brett,'

and a brief extract from his Preface is worth inserting:—

> The following Letters were printed a few years since from MSS. in the Editor's possession, on account of a revival of the charge of Romanism against the Nonjurors of the last century, whose whole history, together with the recorded sentiments of some of the greatest note among them, should put to silence such an accusation. . . . They sought, like our Reformers, to trace the stream to the fountain head, and to be primitive in doctrine, discipline and worship. . . . The Nonjurors, even in the day of weakness and decay, when discussing anxiously the nature of their position, and the course which they should adopt, never turned their eyes towards Rome.

Dr. Brett lived on to this 'day of weakness and decay,' and *he* never turned his eyes towards Rome.

Personally Brett seems to have been an extremely amiable, sociable man. The historian of his college, who knew him well, and wrote only ten years after his death, represents him as

> a learned, pious, and indefatigable author, a worthy, orthodox member of the Church of England and no small honour to her; whose works are a clear indication of his writing in the search of truth, which, if at any time he found himself deviating from, he always took the first opportunity of retracting it in the most public manner. In private life he was a dutiful son, an affectionate husband, a kind parent and a true friend. His conversation was ever facetious, good-natured and easy, tempered with a becoming gravity without moroseness, and so well adapted to those whom he happened to be in company with, that it rendered him agreeable to, as well as esteemed by persons of all ranks who had the pleasure of his acquaintance.[1]

Brett, like Hickes, preserved the most intimate friendship with men outside the Nonjuring communion, and being much more measured in his language he never gave offence as Hickes did. Perhaps the man whom he esteemed more than any other was John Johnson,

[1] Masters' *History of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.*

author of 'The Unbloody Sacrifice,' generally known as 'Johnson of Cranbrook,' because he held for many years the living of Cranbrook, and there wrote most of his very valuable works. The fact that Johnson took the oaths and continued to the end of his life a beneficed clergyman in the Established Church did not in the least interfere with the friendship between him and Brett. They were brought together in many ways. Both were Kentish men by birth and education, and their homes in after life, the one at Wye and the other at Cranbrook, were not so very far apart. Brett was, as we have seen, curate of Great Chart, and Johnson's mother came from Little Chart. Brett and Johnson were both graduates of the same college at Cambridge; both held the same Church views, when those views were quite out of fashion; both were attracted by the same studies, and investigated, far more deeply than most men of their day, the constitution of the Primitive Church in general and its Liturgies (in the proper sense of the term) in particular, and both produced works of permanent value on the subject. When Johnson died Brett wrote an interesting little sketch of his life, in which there is not the faintest trace of the writer's being a Nonjuror, nor the faintest hint, direct or indirect, that, in his opinion, Johnson did wrong in conforming. It is simply the testimony of one good clergyman to the work of another good clergyman, with whom he agreed exactly in every particular, and is a remarkable illustration of what has been already said, that the Nonjuring alienation was only a temporary one, which time was sure to heal. But Brett was very firm and consistent in his own Nonjuring principles, and being a strong man who commanded the respect of his family, he handed those principles down to his children and his grandchildren; and the Bretts of Spring Grove

were among the very last who still remained Nonjurors. Thomas Brett died in his own house in 1743; he took a leading part in the Usages controversy, in the overtures which the Nonjurors made to the Eastern Church, and in the general literature of the Nonjurors; he will therefore meet us again in no less than three separate connections.

Henry Gandy (1649–1734), who was consecrated with Brett, is a man far less known, and has left us no works of the magnitude and importance of Brett's; but he was recognised in his day as one of the ablest controversialists among the Nonjurors, and his writings, which are extant, though slight in bulk, suffice to show that he was a man of considerable ability. He is described in an obituary notice as 'the Suffering Son of a Loyal Father who sacrificed great Ecclesiastical Preferment for Conscience sake, as may be seen on page 69 of Dr. Walker's "History of the Loyal and Episcopal Clergy."' He was a fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, taking his B.A. degree in 1670 and his M.A. in 1674; and we may gather that he continued to reside at Oxford, for he was Senior Proctor for the University in 1683,[1] and he was evidently well known to Oxford residents such as Thomas Hearne, Anthony Wood, Dr. Bailey (President of Magdalen),[2] and Dr. Charlett (Master of University). He then became rector of St. Leonard's, Exeter, which post he held until the Revolution, when he refused the oaths, and lost both his living and his fellowship.[3] Like so many Nonjurors, he appears subsequently to have settled in London, and in 1707 was living in Bartholomew Square, Old Street. But he may have remained for a time at Oxford, for we hear of Anthony

[1] See Wood's *Life and Times* (Oxf. Hist. Soc.), iii. 44.

[2] He appears to have been one of Dr. Bailey's executors. See Hearne's *Collections*, ii. 16, 17.

[3] St. Leonard's, Exeter, is a small living, which he could hold with his fellowship—and did. See Wood's *Life and Times* (Oxf. Hist. Soc.), iii. 384–5.

Wood dining with him there in 1695 ;[1] and Hearne speaks of him two or three times up to 1706, as if he were still at Oxford. But this is conjecture ; it is certain that he succeeded Hickes as officiating minister at the Oratory in Scroop's Court, Holborn. In this chapel he was himself consecrated bishop, and afterwards held several consecrations and ordinations therein. He took an active part in the controversy about 'the Usages,' and wrote some able and vigorous pamphlets on the side of the non-usagers. But his two most notable works were answers to Dr. Higden and Mr. Dodwell. William Higden was at first a Nonjuror, but afterwards took the oaths. In defence of his change of opinions he published in 1709 a book entitled 'A View of the English Constitution, with respect to the Sovereign Authority of the Prince and the Allegiance of the Subject. In Vindication of the Lawfulness of taking the Oaths to Her Majesty, by Law required.' The gist of his argument was that the Prince in possession could lawfully claim allegiance, and it is said that he was induced to publish it by the advice of Archbishop Sharp, who read it in manuscript and approved of it. It was a formidable attack on the Nonjurors, and was answered by many, but by none more ably than by Henry Gandy. His answer was published anonymously, and the authorship was not at first suspected, even at Gandy's own University; for Hearne, who has no fewer than three separate entries in praise of it, pays it at last what in his opinion would be the highest possible compliment by saying that 'he believes the true author of the most excellent book against Higden to be the illustrious George Hickes.' But he soon learned the truth, for he adds in a bracket, ('Mr. Gandy is y^e^ Author, as he tells me himself.')[2]

[1] 'September 25.—Dined with Dr. (Arthur) Charlet, (Henry) Gandy, (Thomas) Creech, and one Harbin, &c.'—*Life and Times*, iii. 490.

[2] See Hearne's *Collections*, ii. 284, 290 and 293.

Hearne was not so well pleased two years later (1711) when Gandy brought out another notable publication, also anonymously, entitled 'A Conference between Gerontius and Junius, in which Mr. Dodwell's "Case in View, now in Fact," is Considered.' Mr. Dodwell wrote, of course, to justify the return of himself and the Shottesbrooke group to the Established Church. Gandy would rank him with Dr. Higden as another deserter of the true cause. One would, therefore, expect him to write severely; and so he does. But his work scarcely deserves all the strictures which have been passed upon it. At any rate, its faults are faults of taste rather than of argument. It was unfortunate for Gandy's credit that Dodwell died unexpectedly just before the attack upon him was published, though not (as the Preface expressly asserts) before it was written. Dodwell's 'Case in Fact' was published in the early spring and Gandy's in the summer of the same year (1711). Dates, therefore, sufficiently show that Gandy did not wait till the lion was dead before he dared to kick him. But it would have been more delicate and in better taste to have postponed the attack, and certainly to have expunged such a passage as this:

> Mr. Dodwell was a very learned man, and has done very eminent service to the Church of God by some of his former writings, and particularly to the Church of England, but, all things considered, I doubt much whether by some of his later writings he has not done more hurt than good to the Church, and made more mischief by his book of 'The Natural Mortality of the Soul' than all his learned works put together can atone for.—[Preface.]

There are also many personalities in the book, which under the circumstances seemed peculiarly ungracious. Of course Dodwell's friends—and there were many who loved him and were proud of him when living, and now

regarded his memory as sacred—were up in arms at once. Hearne, who was as loyal to his friends as he was bitter against his foes, can hardly find language strong enough to express his abhorrence of the book. It is 'a very scurvy, scurrilous book'; 'there is a leaven of envy and malice throughout'; 'the book is despised and not approved by the best judges in Oxford.' Of the writer he speaks more in sorrow than in anger: 'Mr. Gandy is the reputed author; a Non-Juror and an honest man, but mightily blamed by the best men for this odd, scurrilous book'; 'I am very sorry, Mr. Gandy being otherwise a good, conscientious man.'[1] The curious part is that Hearne himself afterwards took, and, indeed, at this very time was virtually taking the line of Gandy, not that of Dodwell.

Putting aside all personal questions of delicacy and good taste, and reading in cold blood the works of Gandy and Dodwell, it certainly seems to me that Gandy has the best of the argument. The evils of separation which every true Churchman feels, and the utter hopelessness of *this* separation being ended by the Jurors coming round to the Nonjurors—that is, an ever *in*creasing majority coming round to an ever *de*creasing minority—make one inclined at all hazards, short of sacrificing truth to peace, to sympathise with Dodwell. But was it possible to reconcile Dodwell with Dodwell?—in other words, to reconcile 'The Case in View' and 'The Case in Fact' with, say, 'The Case of Schism' or 'The Vindication of the deprived Bishops,' or with numberless passages in Dodwell's earlier works? This inconsistency Mr. Gandy seems to me to expose with remorseless and unanswerable logic. His contrast between what 'Mr. Dodwell's old friends say,' and what 'his new friends and his new

[1] See Hearne's *Collections* (Oxf. Hist. Soc.), ii. 200, 215, 320.

fathers say' is racy and, it may be added, exasperating. Given the original premisses, and the only logical conclusion to be drawn from them is surely that which Mr. Gandy draws. Others saw this, and more than one referred to his brochure. An able volume which appeared shortly afterwards, entitled 'Mr. Dodwell's Case in View thoroughly considered, or, The Case of Lay Deprivations and Independency of the Church (in Spirituals) set in a true light by a Presbyter of the Church of England,' specially refers its readers to 'the excellent conference between Gerontius and Junius' (pp. 171–2), and the 'Publisher' of the posthumous papers of Dr. Hickes—that is, no doubt, Dr. Brett—in his address 'to the Reader,' says that 'Mr. Dodwell's principles, on which the separation was to be closed, were directly contrary to his own former Writings, as was plainly prov'd in "The Conference between Gerontius and Junius."' [1]

Among Gandy's other writings was one called 'Jure Divino; or An Answer to all that hath or shall be written by Republicans against the old English Constitution.' It was published anonymously in 1707, and takes almost exactly the same line of argument which Sir R. Filmer took half a century before. He also wrote several tracts on the Usages question, to be noticed presently; and among the Rawlinson MSS. are two thick volumes of closely written matter by Mr. Gandy, all, so far as I have read, on subjects relating to the Nonjurors; but the handwriting is very difficult to decipher, and I must frankly own that I gave up the task in despair.

An absurd report that Gandy towards the end of his life 'turned papist' would not be worth mentioning were

[1] See Hickes's *Constitution of the Catholick Church*, 'The Publisher to the Reader,' p. vii. In the eighteenth century, what we call 'Editor' was often called 'Publisher,' and what we call 'Publisher' was called 'Bookseller.'

it not that the story is repeated, and not contradicted, by a writer who is a popular authority on the eighteenth century.[1] Gandy died, as he lived, a consistent member of what he believed to be the true Church of England. Two very appreciative notices of him appeared in the *Daily Post* and the *London Evening Post*, February 27 and February 28, 1734. In the former he is described as 'a person of great piety, singular modesty, extremely temperate, diligent and regular through the whole course of his life'; and both notices dwell upon his learning and abilities, and also upon his conversational and social powers generally, which he retained unimpaired to extreme old age.

Here this chapter may end. The bishops of the new consecration have been sketched up to the time when an unhappy dispute divided the Nonjurors into two sections, a dispute which was never properly healed, but which on the contrary led to further subdivisions. So those who were consecrated later can hardly be said to stand on the same footing as those who preceded them, and will therefore (with one single exception, which will appear in the next chapter) be treated in connection with the later Nonjurors.

[1] See Noble's *Continuation of Granger*, iii. 173.

CHAPTER IV

THE NONJURING CLERGY

ALTHOUGH the Nonjuring bishops were all of them more or less capable, and some really distinguished, men, there were among 'the inferior clergy' others who were quite their equals in piety, learning, and general reputation, as the present chapter will show.

Let us begin with one who was called to his rest within five years of his deprivation, but the sanctity of whose life and the value of whose writings caused his name constantly to be appealed to, so that 'he being dead yet speaketh.'

John Kettlewell (1653–95) is one of those few men who are recognised by all parties as veritable saints. His naturally sweet and amiable disposition was purified and elevated by Divine grace. Truthful and open as the daylight, a man whom you could trust with absolute confidence, having very strong convictions of his own, yet gentle and forbearing to those who disagreed with him, utterly unselfish, yet quite ready to assert himself when truth required it; modest and retiring, yet always to the front when any good was to be done, he attracted all who came into contact with him by his sheer goodness.

His life may be very simply and briefly told. He was associated from his earliest years, and all through his life, with George Hickes, being born in the same neighbourhood and educated at the same school under the same master. Thence he proceeded to St. Edmund

Hall, Oxford, but having taken his degree he again followed his friend, being elected to a Yorkshire fellowship at Lincoln College. Hickes, who was then a distinguished fellow of Lincoln, may have used his influence to procure the election; but Kettlewell had no need of any favour; he might well have stood on his own merits, intellectual as well as moral and social. For some years (1677–84) he was, as his friend Hickes had been before him, college tutor at Lincoln. It was during this period that he published his first work, 'Measures of Christian Obedience,' which led to his being appointed, first, chaplain to the Dowager Countess of Bedford, and then vicar of Coleshill. As chaplain to the countess he came to know Lord William Russell, and, in spite of their extremely different views on theology and politics, he won the regard of that unhappy gentleman, who sent an affectionate message to him from the scaffold. At Coleshill he was in his proper element as a parish priest, and his relationship with the chief inhabitant and patron of that living was the model of what such a relationship should be. It was a sad pity that after a few years his career at Coleshill was cut short by the Revolution. He had not a moment's hesitation about refusing the new oaths, and he was so much esteemed in the neighbourhood that he carried several others with him into the Nonjuring camp. The rest of his brief life was spent in and about London. He lived in Gray's Inn Lane near his old friend Hickes, and Hickes's neighbour, Robert Nelson. Mr. Secretan tells us that Kettlewell took the place of Tillotson as Nelson's bosom friend, and it was at Kettlewell's instance that Nelson began to write his 'Companion to the Festivals and Fasts of the Church of England.'[1] Nelson, in the Preface to Kettlewell's

[1] See Secretan's *Life of Nelson*, p. 81.

'Five Discourses on so many very important points of Practical Religion,' drew attention to two of his leading characteristics:

He would never condescend to the least Artifice to disguise his sentiments, and abhorred a lie to that degree that the day before he died, dehorting a young relation from all vice, especially Lying, he said, Do not tell a Lye, no, not to save a World, not to save your King, nor yourself. . . . In his *Controversial* Writings, he never treats his Adversaries with Ill Language, Scorn or Contempt; nor with Personal Reflections or injurious Surmises; nor because he thought they erred on one point, did he ever endeavour to make them guilty of all; nor consecrated any unchristian Heat under a pretence of defending Truth. This meek Servant of God hath happily steered clear of that dangerous Rock, whereupon many Learned (and otherwise good) men have fatally split.[1]

'He was certainly,' writes Bishop Ken, 'as saintlike a man as ever I knew';[2] and Ken's latest and fullest biographer says: 'there were few, if any, among his contemporaries for whom Ken had a more profound veneration. He looked to him more than to any other as his spiritual director in the confused questions of the time.'[3] Bishop Ken was brought much into contact with Kettlewell in connection with the relief fund for the distressed clergy, which was suggested by Kettlewell himself, first privately to Bishop Ken, and then officially, as it were, to Bishop Lloyd, as head of the Nonjurors. Kettlewell did not live long enough to see the result of his benevolent scheme. To the very great loss of the Nonjuring cause, he was prematurely cut off when only forty-two years of age, and, by his own desire, was buried in the Church of All-hallows Barking (where his old friend Hickes had been

[1] See *Compleat Collection of the Works of John Kettlewell*, with Life prefixed, &c., i. 179.

[2] See Ken's letter to Robert Nelson, on receipt of the Life of Kettlewell, quoted above. Plumptre's *Life of Ken*, ii. 102.

[3] Plumptre, ii. 101.

rector), under the altar rails, in the grave where Laud's remains had lain until their removal to St. John's College, Oxford. Bishop Ken officiated 'in his formalities,' and, we are told, 'prayed for the King and the Queens,' that is, of course, for King James, Queen Mary, his consort, and Queen Catherine, widow of Charles II., who was still living.

Kettlewell held very decided opinions, and expressed them very decidedly. He took an independent line of his own, and in some respects seems to sanction the views and conduct of one section of the Nonjurors, sometimes those of the other section. So both claimed him for their own, and both could adduce passages from his writings which favoured their own views, not because he was inconsistent, but because he was independent and judged each case on its own merits.

If Kettlewell was one of the saintliest, *Charles Leslie* was one of the ablest, of the Nonjurors. Dr. Johnson's dictum, 'Lesley *was* a reasoner, and a reasoner who was not to be reasoned against,'[1] may be cordially accepted without accepting the amazing assertion which called it forth, that no other Nonjuror could reason.

Charles Leslie (1650–1722) was one of the very few Irishmen who joined the Nonjurors, and even he, though Irish by birth, was Scotch by extraction. He was the son of John Leslie, successively Bishop of the Isles in Scotland and of Raphoe and Clogher in Ireland, and was educated at Enniskillen Grammar School and Trinity College, Dublin. He then entered as a student at the Temple and was a barrister for ten years, in which profession the great reasoning powers which he afterwards showed were no doubt developed and trained. But he was more absorbed in the study of divinity than of law,

[1] Boswell, iv. 196.

and in 1680 he received Holy Orders and became curate of Donagh, the parish in which Glaslough, the family estate, lay (his elder brother, the owner of that estate, being rector). As most of his parishioners were either Roman Catholics or Presbyterians he had not much parochial work, and he employed his ample leisure in study. In 1686 he received, through the influence of Henry, second Earl of Clarendon, always his good friend, the chancellorship of Connor, an office of some dignity but very little emolument. It also gave him very little work, so he had still time for study. At the Revolution he declined to take the prescribed oaths, lost his modest preferment in Ireland, and settled in England. He became private chaplain to Lord Clarendon, and officiated in several parish churches before the Act of Deprivation came into force, and afterwards in Nonjuring chapels, though he never ministered regularly to any congregation. But he was from the first a leading Nonjuror, and it was a matter of surprise to many that he was not selected as one of the new bishops who were consecrated in 1693–4. He was certainly consulted on the general subject, and there is no doubt that he was perfectly satisfied with the selections made. He wrote his very able 'Regale and Pontificate' expressly in vindication of the new consecrations then in view. Leslie's settlement in London brought him into closer contact with the little knot of distinguished Nonjurors in and about the metropolis. With one of the most distinguished of them, Henry Dodwell, his friendship dates from a much earlier period. Both were Irishmen, both had been educated at the same university, and had been early thrown together. They were now united by closer ties as members of the 'suffering remnant.' Through Dodwell, Leslie became intimate with Mr. Francis Cherry and the rest of the group at Shottesbrook. He also

became well known to Robert Nelson and George Hickes. Leslie was, as his biographer rightly remarks, a man of 'ardent nature and solemn convictions.'[1] His 'ardent nature' led him to express himself strongly, especially when writing in the white heat of controversy; his 'solemn convictions' made him feel that such writers as Tillotson, Burnet, and Hoadly were dangerous to the Christian faith, as he understood it; and if this led him into intemperance of tone and words, most dearly did he pay for it, for not only did he suffer, like the rest of the Nonjurors, the loss of all his worldly prospects as a clergyman, but also banishment from his home as an outlaw. Leslie was as strong a Jacobite as he was a Nonjuror, and was often a medium between the King over the water and the Jacobites on this side of it, but he never took part in any of the Jacobite conspiracies. Like Hickes, he did not allow differences of opinion to prevent friendly intercourse with those who disagreed with him. Of all classes of religionists, the Quakers were those against whom he wrote most vehemently and at greatest length; and yet he lodged quite comfortably at the house of a Quaker in London, and resumed his lodging there after he had written his strongest works against the sect. He also drew a marked distinction between those members of 'the Revolution Church' who conformed to it through necessity and those who defended it as the best of all possible Churches.

There is [he wrote] a distinction to be made (and all wise men distinguish them) between the old Church of England men, who have taken the oaths, and comply, and think they can acquit themselves by the Constraint and Force that is upon them, but still retain their old Principles relating to the Monarchy and the Church, who are far the best, the wisest, the

[1] *Life and Writings of Charles Leslie*, by R. J. Leslie, p. 395.

honestest, and the most numerous of the complyers. These, though they satisfy themselves in a compulsive submission, yet are too generous and honest to Deify their Chains, and glory in their Bondage. A man who hath got a heavy load on his back, must bear it as well as he can, but that is no reason to celebrate the burden, and extol it to the skyes, and give immortal honour to that which cripples him. These, therefore, you must pretermit, and they are particularly and expressly excepted as no way concerned in what follows. But then for your St. A—phs, your Til—ns, Ten—ns, B—ts, your Sh—ks, Pat—cks, W—ks, Fl—ds.[1] These are the fine sparks that do all the Feats we are speaking of, who first swallow the morsels of Usurpation, and then dress it up with all the Gaudy and Ridiculous flourishes that an Apostate Eloquence can put upon it.[2]

Leslie acted up to this distinction which he drew. His own brother complied, and yet Charles remained on perfectly friendly terms with him. He wrote an able defence of the complying Bishop Blackall when the latter was attacked by Bishop Hoadly; and, as his biographer points out, it was 'not to the Nonjurors as such, but to the Church of England that he reconciled his converts.'[3]

Leslie had happily a small—a very small—independence of his own; he was not, therefore, reduced to the extremities that some were, though he was sometimes in straitened circumstances. He had married, soon after his ordination, Jane, daughter of Richard Griffith, Dean of Ross, and by her had two sons, Robert and Henry, the former of whom, though in a very inferior degree, inherited some of his father's talent, and one daughter. Leslie was a good husband and a good father; and if he

[1] *I.e.* Lloyd, Bishop of St. Asaph, Tillotson, Tenison, Burnet, Sherlock, Patrick, Wake (?), Fleetwood.

[2] *Remarks on some late Sermons, and in particular on Dr. Sherlock's Sermon at the Temple, December* 30, 1694, *in a Letter to a Friend.* It will be remembered that Hickes drew a very similar distinction. See *supra*, p. 108.

[3] *Life and Writings of Charles Leslie*, &c., by R. J. Leslie, p. 178.

felt at all the inconvenience of a straitened income it was on Mrs. Leslie's account, who was delicate and required change of air and scene. It was a distinct loss to the Church to be deprived of his ministerial services, for he had the reputation of being a good preacher. Lord Clarendon tells us that 'he made a most excellent sermon' at the chapel of Ely House;[1] he is said to have been a very acceptable preacher when he officiated, as he did occasionally, at the Nonjurors' oratories in London; and the fire and vigour of his writings may well lead us to believe that he would be a pulpit orator. His private ministrations, too, which were very effective, would indicate that he would have been a good parish priest. His pen was the only implement he could use in behalf of the Church which he loved, and *that* he used most diligently, as will appear in a later chapter. His friend, Dodwell, gives us a pleasant picture of him in a social light. He writes to Hearne, November 23, 1708: 'Mr. Cherry came home [to Shottesbrook], accompanyed with the excellent Rehearser.[2] We enjoyed his delightfull and improving conversation 'till he was called away from us by another office of charity' (he had been ministering to a widow, who had just lost her husband).[3]

But soon afterwards an event occurred which changed the whole course of his after life. Bishop Burnet made two vehement attacks upon him, one in the House of Lords, and the other in a sermon preached at Salisbury Cathedral, 1709, on the anniversary of the Restoration. Leslie, under the *nom de plume* of 'Misodolus,' which,

[1] *Diary*, p. 303.

[2] In allusion, of course, to the *Rehearsal*, a periodical which Leslie brought out first weekly, and then twice a week, almost exclusively written by himself, for nearly five years (1704–9) in opposition to Tutchin's *Observator*, and other periodicals of the kind.

[3] See Hearne's *Collections*, ii. 152.

however, did not, and probably was not intended to, disguise the real author, replied in a tract bearing the rather aggressive title, 'The Good Old Cause; or, Lying in Truth.' Oddly enough the line he took was the same line which was afterwards taken against himself in the Usages controversy[1]—that is, his pamphlet was an ironical defence of the bishop against some impostor who pretended that Burnet had uttered language in his speech and his sermon which could not possibly have been used by a Christian prelate. The pamphlet was supposed to reflect upon the Government, and a warrant was issued against Leslie on July 24, 1710. He put in no appearance, so on August 8 he was outlawed, and on September 9 a proclamation was issued for his apprehension on account of some 'positions tending to bring in the Pretender.' Mrs. Leslie was in weak health, and could ill bear a long journey; so instead of going abroad, Leslie found refuge for six months in a house belonging to Mr. Cherry, at White Waltham, close to Cherry's and Dodwell's own abode at Shottesbrooke. Leslie called this 'my Tusculum,' and was deeply grateful to Mr. Cherry for his kindness. He was, of course, obliged to live in disguise, and sometimes, it is said, 'wore regimentals.'

In the spring of 1711 he and Mrs. Leslie went to pay a visit at St. Germains on the express invitation of him whom, whether rightly or wrongly, Leslie ever regarded as his only lawful sovereign. His life henceforth was that of a wanderer; we next find him with Mrs. Leslie in Holland; and then, when the Chevalier was forced to leave St. Germains, and settled at Bar-le-Duc, Leslie accepted the post of chaplain to the Anglican members of his household, who were very numerous. His main object was not, as was generally rumoured, 'to convert

[1] See *infra*, p. 298.

the Pretender,' though, of course, as a strong English Churchman, he would have been thankful if his arguments had produced that effect, but simply to have the opportunity of exercising his ministerial functions, which he had not had for many years, and which, like every earnest clergyman, he was naturally anxious to have. Then we find him in Italy, then at St. Germains again, where Mary of Modena, widow of James II., treated him with marked attention; and finally, through the generous intervention of his foe, George I., who declared that 'the old man should come home and die in peace,' again in England. He returned in the autumn of 1721, a broken-down man. The sands of life were fast running out, and the end came on April 13, 1722. He was buried at Glaslough, his old home, which he had not seen for more than thirty years. He left behind him a distinguished name; and the fact that he did so is another instance how very little official position or adventitious eminence of any kind counts in the permanent estimation in which men are held. Just as plain John Keble, who could add no title of dignity of any sort to his name, is known and respected long after archbishops and bishops have been forgotten, so Charles Leslie, who was never anything more than plain Charles Leslie, is known by many who would be hard put to it if they were asked anything about the leading ecclesiastics who were his contemporaries.

From the saintly John Kettlewell and the brilliant Charles Leslie we turn to a different type of Nonjuror—the fine old Cavalier, who, if he had lived in the preceding generation, would have been ready to shed his last drop of blood and spend his last penny for the sake of the Royal Martyr, and was now ready to do the same for the Royal Martyr's son.

Denis Granville, or Grenville (1637–1703), lost more than most men through his refusal to take the oaths, for the simple reason that he had more to lose. To use his own words, he gave up 'the best deanery, the best archdeaconry, and one of the best livings in England' for conscience' sake. How he came to obtain and to hold all these rich preferments his history will explain. He came of an ancient Cornish stock, being a younger son of Sir Bevil Granville, who, having rendered great service to the Royal cause in Cornwall, was killed when fighting for the King in the battle of Lansdowne in 1643. He was educated at Eton and Exeter College, Oxford, and in 1660 he married a daughter of the great Bishop Cosin. In 1661 he was ordained by Bishop Sanderson, together with William Beveridge, for whom he conceived a great reverence; and in the same year his eldest brother, John, who had rendered even greater service than his father to the Royal cause, was created a peer, as Earl of Bath. He was thus marked out for preferment by birth, by marriage, and by the services of his relations; and preferment quickly came to him in rich profusion. In the very year of his ordination he received, on the presentation of his brother, the family living of Kilkhampton in Cornwall. In 1662 he was collated by his father-in-law to the first stall in Durham Cathedral, and in the same year appointed to the Archdeaconry of Durham, with the rich living of Easington annexed; and in 1664 the rectory of Elwick Hall was added. In 1667 he was instituted to the still richer living of Sedgefield, resigning Elwick Hall. All this plethora of preferment coming to him when he had scarcely reached his thirtieth year was too much for him. His father-in-law, Bishop Cosin, complains of his prolonged absences from home; he was constantly at Oxford or in London, being one of the Royal chaplains; he must

have been very extravagant, for, in spite of his large clerical income, he became involved in pecuniary difficulties, and in 1674 was actually arrested for debt. This seems to have proved a wholesome check to him, though he never was quite easy in money matters.[1] All the while, however, there were germs of better things in him. If he neglected his clerical duties himself, he insisted upon his curates working their parishes most diligently on Church lines; he ruled his family very strictly, and the men he most admired were all Christians of a very high type. He made great efforts to establish a weekly celebration of the Holy Communion not only in Durham but in other cathedrals, and his efforts were crowned with considerable success; he waged war against 'pulpit prayers,' which he regarded as a remnant of Puritanism, and in every way strove to fight the battle of the Church. In 1684, through the influence of Lord Crewe, who in 1672 had succeeded Granville's father-in-law as bishop, he was appointed to the wealthy deanery of Durham, still retaining the archdeaconry and his rich livings. Archbishop Sancroft in vain protested, declaring, not very complimentarily, that 'Grenville was not worthy of the least stall in Durham Cathedral;' but the bishop replied that 'he would rather choose a gentleman than a silly fellow who knew nothing but books.' This was very characteristic of the two men; Sancroft would certainly sympathise more with the new dean's Churchmanship than Crewe would; but he had, as events proved, a more sensitive conscience than Crewe, and he did not think that because a man was a good Churchman and a gentleman he should therefore be overloaded with preferments, to the exclusion of others who

[1] This appears in the new *Life of Dean Granville*, by the Rev. Roger Granville, which is an interesting and valuable supplement to the *Remains of Dean Granville*, edited by Canon Ornsby for the Surtees Society, vol. i. in 1861, vol. ii. in 1865.

were of much greater mark. Granville, however, rose to the occasion and made a good dean, using his elevated position, among other ways, for the encouragement of promising young divines. We must allow a little for the partiality of a relative in the following picture of him drawn by his nephew, Lord Lansdowne: 'Sanctity sat so easy, so unaffected, and so graceful upon him, that in him we beheld the very beauty of holiness,' with much more to the same effect.[1] Denis Granville, at least as he appears in the 'Cosin Correspondence,' in his own 'Remains,' and in the new 'Life,' was not a saint like Thomas Ken and John Kettlewell; but others who can be better trusted than his enthusiastic nephew speak very highly of him. Sir George Wheler, for instance, who as canon of Durham and rector of Houghton-le-Spring knew him intimately, bears witness to his 'pious and devout temper,' and Barnabas Oley, whose trustworthiness none will dispute, always spoke of him as 'that truly pious and devout good man, Dr. Granville.'[2] His conduct at the Revolution shows that he was not a selfish man; he did not hesitate one moment about sacrificing deanery, archdeaconry, rich livings, and social standing in the diocese, because he could not keep them with a safe conscience. His account of the matter is well worth studying as it appears in his 'Remains.' 'These embody,' writes the editor in his excellent Introduction, 'the sentiments of one of those high-minded men who chose rather to sacrifice the highest preferment than swear allegiance to one whom they regarded both as an invader and an usurper' (p. iii). The attitude he assumed and maintained was really an heroic one. As soon as ever he heard of the intended invasion of the Prince of Orange he at once took steps to

[1] See Noble's *Continuation of Granger*, i. 118–9.
[2] See *Life in the English Church*, 1660–1714, p. 90.

confirm the loyalty of all those over whom in his various positions he had influence. He impressed upon the parishioners of his country cures the duty of 'subjection and allegiance to their sovereign' in the strongest terms.[1] He summoned 'his brethren the Prebendaries together into their Chapter-House, and persuaded them to assist the King with their purses as well as their prayers.' He called the clergy of his archdeaconry together and urged them 'to secure their flocks to assist their sovereign in the impending crisis.' He tried to persuade the chapter and the magistracy of the county to join in a loyal address to the King expressing a horror of the invasion; and when he failed, he sent in a personal address of his own. This was intercepted, and fell into the hands of the Earl of Danby, Lord Lumley, and other adherents of the Prince at York. On Advent Sunday, 1688, Durham was occupied by Lord Lumley at the very time when the dean was preaching an Advent sermon in the cathedral. This did not in the least daunt him, though he stood almost alone as a supporter of James. On the next Sunday he again preached in the cathedral 'a seasonable, loyall sermon, to persuade the members of that church and all the auditory, to stand firm to their allegiance in that day of temptation, and never to joyne in the least wayes with that horrid rebellion which was at that time sett on foot in the nation.' To his bitter mortification his own brother, the Earl of Bath, 'sullied the hitherto stainless loyalty of the house of Granville by joining the usurper.' After the defeat of James in Ireland and his retreat into France, Granville joined the exiled Court at St. Germains, where there were members of the Church of England who naturally desired to worship God after their own fashion; and they wished to have Dean Granvill for

[1] See *Remains*, i. 67, and *passim*.

their chaplain; but the request was refused. Attempts were made to bring him over to the Church of Rome, which he steadily resisted; but he was so worried by the priests who surrounded King James that he retired to Paris, where he died in lodgings in very reduced circumstances in 1703.

When he first left England, he issued towards the close of 1689, 'From my study at Rouen,' an interesting work with the following portentous title:

'The Resigned and Resolved Christian and Faithful and Undaunted Royalist in Two Plain Sermons and a Loyal Farewell Visitation-Speech,' both delivered amidst the lamentable confusions occasioned by the late Foreign Invasion and Home Defection of his Majesty's subjects in England by D. G., Dean and Archdeacon of Durham (now in exile) Chaplain in Ordinary to his Majesty, whereunto are added certain Letters to his relations and friends in England, shewing the Reason and Maner of his withdrawing out of the Kingdom, viz. A Letter to his brother, the Earle of Bath, A Letter to his Bishop, the Bishop of Durham; a Letter to his Brethren, the Prebendaryes; a Letter to the Clergy of his Archdeaconry; a Letter to his Curates at Easington and Sedgfield.

It is dedicated to 'The Queen of England,' that is, of course, Mary Beatrice of Modena. In his 'Address to the Reader' he desires 'all persons in England who have laboured, either by kind invitations or threats of deprivation, to prevaile with me to return, and submit to the new Government, to receive this my final answer—to wit: If I be deprived, I am deprived; or, to approach a little nearer to the phrase of good father Jacob, *If I be bereaved* (of my preferment), I am bereaved.'[1] The tenour of the sermons, the speech, and the letters may be guessed from what has been written above. It need only be added that in his letters to the different clergy, he could use a telling argument, which, like many others

[1] See *Remains*, i. 5–7

who complied, they would find it very difficult to answer. He appealed to their former teaching, and asked how they could reconcile it with their present conduct. He could say to Bishop Crewe, 'Your *Lordship*, I am sure (which is my comfort), will be none of those who shall load me with reproaches for my dutyfull complyance with his Majesty, since *your example* (*which did outrun others*) as well as your advice, did powerfully incite me thereto;' to the vice-dean and prebendaries:

> Such a notorious contradiction of your own past preaching and practice must, I fear, render you very cheap among those people which you have drawn into a snare by a very sinfull example, and who have too much sense not to discern the illness thereof, though they want courage to resist it. You very often in my presence preach'd false doctrine if your present proceedings and complyance are justifyable;

to the clergy of the archdeaconry: 'I have reason to believe that all of you know your duty well enough, since the prerogative of the king, passive obedience and non-resistance were preach'd up by you in the Bishoprick of Durham with more zeal than in any diocese of England.' The dean also wrote to Archbishop Sancroft assuring him of his loyalty, which was generous on his part, seeing that Sancroft had opposed his appointment to the deanery; and to Beveridge, then Archdeacon of Colchester, whom he addresses more in sorrow than in anger, urging him to act worthily of his high character and return to his proper allegiance, and assuring him that many will follow his example: 'Leap forth, then, in the name of God, and lead on your brethren!' Denis Granville was a good specimen of what may be called, without disrespect, the fine old crusted Royalists, of whom it is hard to say whether their enthusiasm for the Church more strengthened their attachment to the monarchy, or their

attachment to the monarchy strengthened their attachment to the Church. They represented rather a different type of mind from that of the majority of the Nonjurors. They were survivals of the past, and were more numerous in the earlier than in the later part of the seventeenth century, and the type quite died out in the eighteenth.

Dean Granville was an Oxford man, but had no further connection with the University than having graduated there. We now come, however, to two prominent Nonjurors who were fellows of Magdalen; both were residents, one for a few years, the other for the whole of his adult life; both took a deep interest in their college, and showed their interest in it to the last.

John Fitzwilliam (1636?–1699) is one of the few Nonjurors of whom Lord Macaulay writes in tones of unqualified praise, coupling his name with that of John Kettlewell, and saying that they both 'deserve special mention, less on account of their abilities and learning, than on account of their rare integrity, and of their not less rare candour.' Fitzwilliam was a prominent Churchman all through the period between the Restoration and the Revolution. He entered as a servitor at Magdalen College, Oxford, in 1651, was elected to a demyship shortly afterwards, and to a fellowship in 1661, which he held until 1670. Anthony Wood says, rather maliciously, that at the Restoration 'he turned about and became a great complier to the restored liturgy.' But Fitzwilliam was a contemporary and friend of Ken in his undergraduate days, and one can scarcely fancy Ken making a friend of one who required to 'turn about' when the liturgy was restored. Moreover, Fitzwilliam preached and printed a sermon in 1683 on the public thanksgiving for the delivery of the King from the Rye-House Plot, in which he appeals to 'the zeal I had for the present Government

even while it was merely to be enjoyed in hopes, and we could only wish it might be restored.' He would hardly have made this public assertion when it could easily have been contradicted, if it had not been true. But, at any rate, it is rather unfair to cast up against a man what he may have done or thought when he was a mere boy. Certainly during the whole of his clerical—that is, his adult—life his course was perfectly consistent; it was that of a plain English Churchman by conviction. He was brought into close contact with some of the leading Churchmen of the day. He was a lifelong friend of Ken and Kettlewell. Dean Plumptre associates his name with those of Kettlewell and Robert Nelson, as three men 'of whom the world was not worthy, whose holiness of life probably contributed in no small measure to influence Ken's decision' not to take the oaths.[1] Bishop Morley and Bishop Turner were also among his friends and patrons. After his election to his fellowship he resided in college, and became college librarian and university lecturer on music. But in 1664 he left Oxford, being recommended by Dr. Morley (the very last man, by the way, to have patronised 'a complier' who had 'turned about' at the Restoration) to the Lord Treasurer, Thomas Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton, who made him his domestic chaplain and tutor to his two daughters, with one of whom he maintained a lifelong friendship. On the death of the earl, Bishop Morley 'took him into his own household,' and in 1666 recommended him as chaplain to James, Duke of York, to whose daughter, afterwards Queen Anne, he became tutor. In 1669 the same kind patron appointed him rector of Brighstone, in succession to his friend, Thomas Ken. Then another friend from the old undergraduate days, Francis Turner, now Bishop

[1] *Life of Ken*, ii. 45.

of Ely, gave him the living of Cottenham, and finally he was promoted by the Crown to a canonry at Windsor. So, at the time of the Revolution, he was canon of Windsor and rector of Cottenham, two very comfortable posts; though, of course, nothing like the rich preferments surrendered by Dean Granville. He had, however, a real sacrifice to make, and he made it cheerfully. He is now chiefly known through his correspondence with Rachel, Lady Russell, daughter of Lord Southampton, who had been his pupil when a child, and who took him for her guide and spiritual adviser till the end of his life, and especially in her great sorrow, when her husband was executed for his supposed complicity in the Rye-House Plot. Fitzwilliam always believed in Lord William's innocence, and was a witness for the defence at his trial. The friend of Ken, Turner and Kettlewell, on the one hand, and of Lord Southampton, Lord William and Lady Rachel Russell on the other, may seem oddly mixed up with what we should now call 'high' and 'low' Church people. But until quite the close of the seventeenth century these terms were hardly known. Before then, Church people were simply Church people, without any epithet, and if Lady Rachel wished for guidance in leading a consistent Church life, she would require one who was simply a Churchman for her director; and such an one she undoubtedly found in John Fitzwilliam. It is, however, somewhat curious that he should have been called as witness for the defence at the trials of two men of such very opposite sentiments as Lord William Russell, the exclusionist, and John Ashton, the Jacobite. At the trial of the latter he gives us a glimpse of his own conduct and principles. He bears witness that he had seen Ashton at the Holy Communion in Ely Chapel—that is, Bishop Turner's chapel at Ely House, Holborn—

and when asked whether King William and Queen Mary were prayed for by name, admitted that the names, as inserted, were not mentioned, and implied that he was a regular worshipper there. When asked whether *he* had taken the oaths to the new king and queen, 'No, I have not, Sir,' he replied, 'that's my unhappiness; but I know how to submit and live peaceably under them.' And he added, 'If anyone can say I have done or acted anything against the Government, I will readily submit to be punished for it.'[1] He never *did* act in any way against the Government; but, in spite of the earnest entreaties of Lady Rachel, he never could be persuaded to take the oaths. He lived in an attic in London, where there was no room for his books; and the only favour he asked of Lady Rachel was that she would try to find room somewhere for them. He was not, however, reduced to actual penury, for he left in his will a life interest in 500*l.* to his old friend Ken, whom he made his executor; on Ken's death, the money was to go to the library of Magdalen College.[2]

Fitzwilliam published nothing except the single sermon already alluded to; but among the Rawlinson MSS. are a number of theological treatises written by him in excellent Latin. One of them is entitled 'De Juramento non suscipiendo (1695),' which gives a lucid apology for his not taking the oath to King William; another is a devotional treatise 'On Prayer,' written in English.

Thomas Smith (1638–1710) graduated from Queen's College in 1661, and in 1663 was appointed Master of the Magdalen School (*Ludi Magister*). He was

[1] Lathbury, p. 80.

[2] See Hearne's *Collections*, iii. 88. Also *Reliquiæ Hearnianæ*, ii. 30, where Hearne vindicates Fitzwilliam from some depreciatory remarks of Dr. Charlett, saying 'Tis well known he was a very wise and a very good, as well as a learned man.'

elected probationer fellow of Magdalen in 1666, and actual fellow in 1667, and held his fellowship till he was ejected as a Nonjuror, filling various college offices. In 1668 he went to the East as chaplain to Sir Daniel Harvey, ambassador at Constantinople, and after three years' sojourn returned, bringing with him a number of Greek manuscripts and filled with a deep interest in the Greek Church. Thus he was a precursor of those later Nonjurors who made advances to that Church. He was so full of his subject that he was nicknamed at Oxford 'Rabbi Smith' and 'Tōgrai Smith,' Tōgrai being the name of an Arabian author, whose poem he had edited.[1] He took a prominent part in the memorable election of the President of Magdalen in 1687, and his diary furnishes us with a valuable help for unravelling the complications in which the question was involved.[2] Thomas Smith incurred great odium for his action in the matter, but most unjustly; his conduct was honest and straightforward from first to last, and quite consistent with the principles he professed and acted upon all his life long. On the one hand, he tried to maintain that attitude of passive obedience and non-resistance which had nowhere been so strongly, authoritatively, and frequently enforced as in his own University. On the other hand, he strove to be perfectly loyal to the Church of England. He was influenced by no selfish considerations; he had shown this from the very beginning. When the old president died in March 1687, he had some reasonable hope of succeeding to the post; for he had been elected vice-president in 1682 and was now senior bursar; he was a man distinguished for his learning; and he had

[1] See J. R. Bloxam's *Magdalen College Register*, iii. 196 *et seq.*

[2] See *Magdalen College and King James II.*, edited by Dr. Bloxam for the Oxford Historical Society, *passim*, especially the admirable Introduction by Canon Bramley.

a powerful friend at Court in the Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Parker), through whom he might obtain a Royal letter of recommendation to the College. But 'the King,' said Parker, 'will recommend no person who is not a friend to His Majesty's religion. What can you do to please him as to that matter?' Smith replied that if he became president he would make it his business to advance piety and learning, to keep men dutiful and obedient to the King's person and government, and truly loyal, and to promote true Catholic Christianity. 'That will not do,' said the bishop. 'Then,' replied Smith, 'let who will take the Presidentship for me, I will look no more after it.' Between his loyalty to the Church and his loyalty to the King he was placed in an awkward dilemma. He utterly opposed the appointment of the first Royal nominee, Anthony Farmer, who was neither statutably nor morally qualified; but when the King issued a mandate for the election of the Bishop of Oxford, Smith with his feelings of loyalty could hold out no longer, but submitted unreservedly to the Royal mandate. In fact he took a middle course, and shared the usual fate; being abused by both sides, especially by that side with which he was most in sympathy. 'I was bespattered,' he says, 'with horrible, scandalous and diabolical reflections, as though I were a Papist, or at least would soon declare myself such: that I had perjuriously violated my Founder's Statutes, and that by this compliance I was making my court to get preferment.'[1] This was in London. But it was the same at Oxford; his Oxford nickname, 'Dr. Tōgrai,' became by an easy transition 'Dr. Roguery,' and he was regarded as the most glaring instance of what was contemptuously called

[1] Dr. Smith's Diary in *Magdalen College and James II.*, p. 215, with more to the same effect in p. 216.

'the Magdalen conscience.' But his motives were cruelly misrepresented: he neither received nor desired any preferment; he had not the faintest intention of becoming a Roman Catholic; when, on the death of Parker within a few months, James succeeded in intruding a Roman Catholic into the presidentship, Smith 'refused to live among the new Popish Fellows,' was ejected from his fellowship (August 3, 1688), and only restored to it when all the rest were on October 25, 1688. Posterity has done more justice to him in the matter than his contemporaries did. Lord Macaulay, in spite of his Whig prejudices against the Nonjurors, speaks highly of Smith's conduct throughout.[1] There are no better authorities on Magdalen affairs than Dr. Routh, Dr. Bloxam, and Canon Bramley, and they all vindicate Smith's conduct.[2]

To pass on to the next scene in Smith's life. Notwithstanding the trouble in which James II. had involved him, he remained a firm Jacobite, and again lost his fellowship as a Nonjuror. The oaths were not so quickly and rigorously enforced at the Universities, where the clergy had no parochial charge, as they were elsewhere, and Smith held his fellowship until 1692. He lived in London, where he had a notice from the president, Dr. Hough, 'that he must come to Oxford and take the oaths, or send a certificate of his having done, as he had received a fresh command from the Queen [King William was abroad in the field of war] requiring the judges of assize to tender the oaths again to all such as had not taken them, and to execute the laws immediately upon such as refused.' Smith replied:

I cannot come down to Oxford upon the account for which I am summoned; much less can I, or shall I, send a certificate

[1] See *History of England*, chap. viii.

[2] *Magdalen College and James II.*, Introd. p. xxviii, note; J. R. Bloxam's *Magdalen College Register*, iii. 196, *et seq.*; and Routh's note to Burnet, p. 182.

as I am required, preferring the peace of mind and satisfaction of my conscience before the enjoying of my Fellowship; yet I wish all happiness and prosperity to the College, and shall during the remainder of the time which by the good Providence of God I have to live, endeavour to serve it as I may, and as I ought, to the utmost of my power.

Upon this his fellowship was pronounced void by the president and fellows—July 25, 1692—and Oxford lost 'one of the best scholars that were ever bred in Magdalen College, and indeed in this University,'[1] or, as Mr. Doble expresses it, 'one of the most learned men in a learned generation.'[2]

Thomas Smith, after some vicissitudes, found a kind patron in a layman of kindred tastes and sympathies, Sir John Cotton, grandson of the famous antiquary, of whose household at Westminster he was an inmate for several years. He more than repaid the obligation by taking charge of the priceless Cottonian Manuscripts, finding a congenial employment in drawing up a catalogue of them, and guarding them jealously. The death of his patron in the autumn of 1702 did not cause the immediate removal of Smith from Westminster. He still remained as the guest of Sir John's successor; but the last period of his life was spent in the house of his friend, Hilkiah Bedford, in Dean Street, Soho, where he died, May 11, 1710. During the last few years of his life he held a pretty frequent correspondence with Bishop Ken, who evidently had the highest opinion of his learning. From these letters we gather that Smith was in somewhat straitened circumstances at the close of his life. He sends Ken copies of his later works, and Ken sends him money (which one would have thought the poor deprived bishop could ill have spared), interests 'the good lord'

[1] Hearne's *Collections*, iii. 15.

[2] Introduction to Hearne's *Collections*, vol. ii. p. viii.

(Weymouth) in his behalf, and begs Smith to let him know when he is 'in any streight, or wants supplys, to carry on his labours of love for the publick.'[1] Smith, however, is quite the reverse of an importunate beggar. He deprecates Ken's gifts; assures him that since his deprivation he has been supported by a brother with whom he lives, and that his literary labours and gifts of friends have secured him from penury; considering Ken's 'narrow circumstances,' he receives his bounty 'with great reluctance,' and recommends a 'Lady Dutton and her daughters' as more in need of it. But it was a pleasure to Ken to give 'what,' he says, 'I can well spare' to his friend, whom he had probably known from the old days when they were undergraduates together, and when 'our deare friend the Bishop of Ely [Turner], now with God,' was the intimate of both. It was an additional pleasure, because Smith, instead of plunging into politics, as some Nonjurors did to Ken's great regret, devoted himself to literary work; indeed, he adds, 'considering your labours of love and learning, all your friends can give to you is given to the publick.'[2]

Smith, however, though he wisely let politics alone, was in his heart a far more thoroughpaced Jacobite and Nonjuror than Ken ever was. On these points he sympathised much more closely with a younger friend and correspondent, Thomas Hearne. His correspondence with Hearne is most voluminous, and shows the vast extent of his learning and the wide variety of subjects in which he is interested. Hearne consults him on all sorts of topics, and pays the greatest deference to his opinion on them all. The relationship between the old and the young scholar (there was forty years' difference between their ages) is a very interesting one. They agreed on all

[1] Plumptre's *Life of Ken*, ii. 184.

[2] *Ibid.* ii. 189.

points; and the elder can upon occasion, though not so frequently, express himself quite as bitterly as the younger on the iniquities of the Revolution settlement and all its abettors. Smith did not, indeed, live long enough to see the establishment of the Hanoverian dynasty, the object of Hearne's particular aversion; but there is little doubt that he would have shared the feeling of his young friend and disciple. Hearne felt his loss deeply, and makes more than one touching reference to it. On May 13, 1710, he writes:

> On Thursday morning last between 3 and 4 clock, died my truly learned and excellent Friend Dr. Thomas Smith, in the threescore and twelfth Year of his Age. He died an undaunted Confessor of the poor, distress'd, and afflicted Church of England, and always stood stiff and resolute to the Doctrines of it as laid down in our Articles and Homilies. As he was a man of very great Learning, so he was withall modest, humble, and wonderfull communicative, of indefatigable Industry, and of more than ordinary Curiosity in discovering and preserving the Writings of learned Men, especially those of our own Countrey, w^ch^ is much indebted to him for the Lives of divers of them, as well as for several other usefull & good Books.[1]

Thomas Crosthwaite (1640?–1710) was another Oxford resident who refused to take the oaths to William and Mary. He was evidently a prominent man in his day, though his very name is now forgotten. He graduated at Queen's College in 1660, and became a fellow of that society. On May 15, 1684, he was elected principal of St. Edmund Hall; but there was a dispute about the election, which is vividly described by Andrew Allam, the antiquary, who was vice-principal of the Hall at the time, as also by Wood and Hearne.[2] He lived, after

[1] *Collections*, ii. 389. See also ii. 397, iii. 15, and *passim*.

[2] See Tanner MS., quoted by Rev. A. Clark in a note to his *Life and Times of Anthony Wood* (Oxf. Hist. Soc.), iii. 116 and 186; Hearne's *Collections*, i. 306; ii. 339, 341, 345, 349.

his expulsion from his fellowship as a Nonjuror, for a time on a small hereditary estate in the north, but returned to Oxford, where, like Baker at Cambridge, he was allowed to retain his rooms at Queen's. His death is thus described by Hearne:

> Jan. 30, 1710.—This day died Dr. Thomas Crosthwaite of Queen's College, leaving the character behind him of a learned orthodox Divine, and an undaunted sufferer for his allegiance to his undoubted Sovereign, and his adherence to the Doctrine of the Church of England. He was buried in Queen's Coll. Chappell on Wednesday night following, between nine and ten of the clock.[1]

Oddly enough, a 'Speech was spoken at his Funeral by Mr. Tickel,' the poet, who was then a junior fellow of Queen's, but took quite the opposite views on politics and theology from those of Crosthwaite, 'commending the Doctor for his Learning and Constancy, and for his Tranquillity of mind to the last.'

Oxford was not only a nursery for Jacobites and Nonjurors, but also a place in which for several reasons they would be inclined to linger. It had always been a stronghold of the Stuarts, and especially of that Stuart who was in a measure glorified as the Royal Martyr. The Stuarts, moreover, with all their faults, had always been encouragers of learning and culture, which a great University like Oxford was presumably intended to promote; and this can hardly be said of those who took their place. Again, there was an old-world air about Oxford, with its venerable cloisters, its spires, its towers, and its domes, which harmonised with the frame of mind which led men to adhere to the old line through evil report and good report. Oxford, too, was then essentially a Church centre, and devotion to the Church was a still stronger passion

[1] *Collections*, ii. 341.

in the Nonjurors than devotion to the King. Nor was it only a sentimental, but also a practical, motive which attracted them to Oxford. Being cut off by their principles from active service to the public, many of the Nonjurors devoted themselves heart and soul to literary work, and there was no place (except Cambridge) where they could find the same help for such work. *There* noble libraries, easily accessible, were found in rich abundance; *there* kindred spirits with whom they might exchange thoughts met them at every turn; *there* they might sharpen their intellects by arguing with those who held different views, and could present those views in the strongest form. A history of the Nonjurors, therefore, must necessarily have much to do with Oxford; and we must not leave the old University, 'paved with the skulls of Jacobites,' 'the home of lost causes and impossible loyaltys,' yet awhile.

There was, to put it mildly, a strong Nonjuring and Jacobite leaven even among the constituted authorities of the place, who had, of course, taken the oaths themselves. It will be remembered that one of the allegations brought by Gibbon, the historian, against the fellows of Magdalen was that 'their constitutional toasts were not expressive of the most lively loyalty for the house of Hanover.'[1] This was in 1752, when Jacobitism was fast dying out all over the kingdom; and, if the old feeling of loyalty to the Stuarts was rife at an Oxford College then, we may be sure that it was ten times more rife at an earlier period. Nicholas Amhurst tells us in his 'Terræ Filius' (1721, &c.) that 'the pretender's health was drunk openly and unreservedly in all places'; and, among other symptoms of Jacobitism, gives an extraordinary story of 'a gentleman of

[1] *Memoirs of my Life and Writings*, in *Miscellaneous Works of Edward Gibbon*, i. 38, edited by John, Lord Sheffield (1796).

Merton College,' a Mr. Meadowcourt, being 'put into the [proctor's] black book for drinking King George's health,' and 'kept out of his degree for two years.' Some of the highest dignitaries in the University were, to say the least, not unfavourable to the Nonjurors. Dr. Thomas Turner, for instance, President of Corpus Christi College, though he was not himself a Nonjuror,[1] could hardly be hostile to the party. He was in frequent and friendly correspondence with his brother, that arch-Jacobite and Nonjuror, Bishop Francis Turner, was entirely in his confidence, and sheltered him in his distress. He offered a chaplaincy at Corpus to Hearne (who never made the slightest disguise of his opinions), intimating that his refusal of the oaths need be no obstacle; and he was, as Hearne says, 'very kind to the Nonjurors' generally. Dr. Thomas Bayley, who was elected President of Magdalen in 1703, in succession to Dr. Hough, could not in common decency be harsh to the Nonjurors. He had been a Nonjuror himself, and had been deprived, as such, of the Magdalen living of Slimbridge at the Revolution; and he remained a Nonjuror for twelve years, only taking the oaths just before his election as president. Again, how could the Principal of St. Edmund Hall, Dr. John Mill, be really hostile to the Nonjurors, seeing that he himself notoriously for a long time 'pendulus hæsit de juramento fidelitatis'? His vacillation was a by-word at Oxford; he was nicknamed 'Johnny Wind-Mill,' and the children used, we are told, to sing about the streets:

> 'Wilt thou take the oaths, little Johnny Mill?'
> 'No, no, that I won't, yes, but I will.'[2]

St. Edmund Hall, indeed, was a great stronghold of Nonjurors, and, as will appear presently, some of the best

[1] He was often erroneously called so. [2] Hearne's *Collections*, i. 189–90.

and ablest of them were educated there. Again, Dr. William King, who was elected Principal of St. Mary Hall in 1719, and held that post for more than forty years, was long the head of the Jacobite party at Oxford, and did not conceal his sentiments. In 1749 he made a Latin speech in the Sheldonian Theatre on the occasion of the opening of the Radcliffe Library, and in his peroration introduced the word 'Redeat' six times, each time making a long pause after it. The significance was at once perceived, and greeted with loud applause. It is true that he subsequently changed his views, and in his 'Anecdotes of His Own Times' speaks anything but favourably of the King over the water, and is also very abusive of some of the Nonjurors, but that is after there had been a quarrel;[1] previously, as they must well have known, all his sympathies were in their favour. Pembroke, again, elected as its master in 1714 Matthew Panting, whom Dr. Johnson styled 'a fine Jacobite fellow,' and Hearne 'an honest gentleman,' meaning the same thing.[2] At St. John's College Dr. Delaune, who was president from 1698 to 1728, was notoriously a Jacobite at heart, and the sympathies of the fellows were with him. 'It is said,' writes Mr. Hutton, 'that Dr. Holmes, President from 1728 to 1748, was the only Fellow for a long time who was a Hanoverian, and the first Hanoverian head.' Mr. Hutton gives some amusing instances of the Jacobitism which was covertly hinted at in the College Chapel, as when Dr. Delaune, or possibly Mr. Wharton, 'thundered forth the words, "*Restoreth* all things,"' and another preacher gave as his text 'James the Third and Eighth.'[3]

[1] See *Political and Literary Anecdotes of His Own Times*, by Dr. Wm. King, Principal of St. Mary Hall, Oxon., p. 191 *et seq.* (2nd edit., 1819).

[2] See *History of Pembroke College, Oxford* (Oxf. Hist. Soc.), *passim*.

[3] See *College Histories: St. John Baptist's College*, by W. H. Hutton, pp. 193–7.

Balliol College seems to have been absolutely honeycombed with Jacobitism.

No less than five Fellows were expelled at the Revolution for refusing to recognize the change of dynasty, and those who submitted were at heart of the same opinion as those who held firm. The Nonjurors, though deprived of their Fellowships, hung about the College, and infected it with their own enthusiasm for the House of Stuart. Hearne walked out of Oxford in June, 1715, with three Balliol men to celebrate the birthday of King James III.; and tells two months later of an assault made by Balliol scholars [that is, no doubt, undergraduates] on a recruiting officer of King George. . . . The Fellows shared to the full in the prejudices of their Juniors. In 1723 they elected Canon Brydges of Rochester as their Visitor because he was a friend of Atterbury; the majority of the Fellows were, until 1760, more than half inclined to be Jacobites.[1]

One of the five Balliol fellows ejected at the Revolution, *Theophilus Downes*, obtained some notoriety as writer of the Introduction to a book called 'Hereditary Right Considered,' which was regarded as one of the most extreme books ever written against the Revolution settlement and the Hanoverian succession. He also wrote one of the many answers against Dr. Sherlock's 'Case of Allegiance' and 'Discourse concerning the Signification of Allegiance,' and other works which were not on strictly Nonjuring subjects. Hearne tells us that he 'travelled several times abroad with young gentlemen,'[2] a not infrequent resource for distressed Nonjurors. Theophilus must not be confounded with Samuel Downes, who was also an ejected Oxford fellow, but belongs to a later period, and will be noticed in a later chapter.

Perhaps this will be the best place to notice another very estimable Nonjuror who had been an Oxford fellow, but had probably given up his fellowship, and had cer-

[1] *College Histories: Balliol College*, pp. 168–9.
[2] *Collections*, ii. 103 and 430.

tainly become a parish priest and a small dignitary in the Church when he was deprived of his preferments after the Revolution.

Walter Harte (1651–1735) would probably, like so many quiet sufferers for conscience' sake, have passed into oblivion had not his son of the same name, who was a poet of some note in his day, paid a pious tribute to his father's memory. But Walter Harte the elder is well deserving of special notice, and was evidently so regarded by his contemporaries; for when Dr. Rawlinson was making collections for his projected History of the Nonjurors he made minute inquiries about him through a Mr. Tomkins, of Axminster. Harte replied, June 26, 1733, saying that he was born on SS. Simon and Jude's Day, 1651, in the parish of St. Aldate's, Oxford, his family being 'plebean' on both sides; was educated in a school at Oxford, then called Silvester's School in the parish of All Saints', Oxford, for three years, and for five at the Free School at Abingdon; was elected from thence Scholar of Pembroke, Oxon., on Mr. Tisdale's foundation in 1667 and fellow in 1674, having graduated in 1671; was ordained by Dr. Fell in 1676. Then he answers the 'Querie' about his 'Preferments, Patrons, &c.':

> The Vicarige of S^{t} Mary Magdaline Chur: Taunton, Prebend of Ashill in the Ch: of Wells, Prebend of Bristol [all in 1684], Patron of the Ch. at Taunton, Sir W^{m} Portman, Bart.; of the Prebend of Ashill, L^{d} B^{p} of Ba: and Wells, Pater Meus: of the Prebend of Bris. L^{d} Keeper North, and begged of him by Sir W. Portman, to be given to the Vicar of S^{t} Mary Mag. Taunton, as an encouragement.[1]

This account is slightly at variance with that given in the Life of Walter Harte, the younger, prefixed to his

[1] The letter is given in one of the MS. books belonging to St. John's College Library, Cambridge.

poems in 'Anderson's British Poets,' which, however, may be quoted for what it is worth:

> His father had been Fellow of Pembroke College, Oxford, Prebendary of Bristol, and Canon of Wells, but he was dispossessed of his preferments in 1691 for refusing to take the oaths. He obtained his present of Bristol by recommendation of Lord Chancellor Jeffries, in return for the manly freedom with which he remonstrated against the severities at Taunton. By the kindness of Bishops Kidder, Hooper and Wynne, he received the little profits of the canonry of Wells till the time of his death, which happened at Kintbury [sic] in Berks, Feb. 10, 1735. Lord Chancellor Harcourt offered him a bishopric from Queen Anne; but the favour was declined with grateful acknowledgments.[1]

Harte lived for many years in studious retirement, having many friends of the most varied type who all loved and respected him. In 1724 he must have been living at Chipping Norton, for his son, the poet, matriculated in that year at St. Mary Hall, and is entered as 'son of Walter Harte, of Chipping Norton, Clerk'; but he was at Kintbury in 1733, for he dates the letter quoted above from thence, and there he died in 1735. The younger Walter Harte paid a poetical tribute to his father with the suggestive title 'Macarius [the Blessed], or The Confessor,' from which the following extract may be given:

> When crowns were doubtful, and when numbers steered
> As honour prompted or self-interest veered
> . . . . . .
> Our hero pass'd—and, weighing either side,
> Took poverty and conscience for his guide;
> For he who thinks he suffers for his God,
> Deserves a pardon though he feels the rod.
> Yet blam'd he none (Himself in honour clear),
> That were a crime had cost his virtue dear!
> Thus all he lov'd, and party he had none,
> Except with Charity, and Heaven alone.

[1] Life of Walter Harte, the *younger*, prefixed to his 'Poems' in Anderson's *British Poets*, ix. 515 *et seq.*

B——[1] sometimes would to thy cottage tend,
An artful enemy, but seeming friend;
Conscious of having planned thy worldly fate,
He could not love thee and he durst not hate.
But the seraphic Ken was all thy own,
And he who long declined Ken's vacant throne,[2]
Begging with earnest zeal to be deny'd.
By worldlings laught at, and by fools decry'd;
Dodwell was thine, the humble and resigned
Nelson, with Christian elegance of mind;
And he whose tranquil mildness from afar,
Spoke him a distant, but a brilliant star.[3]
These all forsook their homes—nor sighed nor wept,
Mammon they freely gave, but God they kept.
Ah! look on honour with Macarius' eyes,
Snares to the good and dangers to the wise.
Accept this verse, to make thy mem'ry live,
Lamented shade! 'tis all thy son can give.

O Pope, too great to copy or to praise:
Forgive the grateful tribute of my lays.
By thee the good Macarius was approved,
Whom Fenton honoured and Philotheus [4] loved.

But the great Tory University never produced such a secession *en masse* to the Nonjuring cause as occurred in one college at her sister University, which was more inclined to the Whig side. Indeed, the number of resident members who became avowed Nonjurors was much greater at Cambridge than it was at Oxford. But this, though apparently, is not really, inconsistent with the fact that Oxford was the chief stronghold of Jacobitism; for no place illustrates more strikingly than Oxford a fact already intimated, that 'Jacobite' and 'Nonjuror' are by no means convertible terms. From the great

[1] Bishop Burnet. [2] Bishop Hooper. [3] John Kettlewell.
[4] Bishop Ken. For Fenton, see *infra*, p. 258–9. Pope was a steady friend and patron of the younger Harte.

Dean of Christ Church (Atterbury) downwards there were members of the University who were Jacobites to the core, but never 'scrupled the oaths.' And from a political point of view one can understand their position. If they really wanted 'the King over the water' to return, their policy was not, Achilles-like, to sulk in their tents; *that* was not the way to bring their Briseis back. If they meant to produce any effect they must enter into the arena; the House of Lords must not be left to Presbyterian bishops; the immense influence which the national pulpits could still exercise politically must not be left to Whig orators. In rather a different sense from that which the poet intended, they might say

> Princes and lords may flourish, or may fade.
> A breath can make them, as a breath hath made.

And a breath could also *un*make a monarch with a mere parliamentary title; therefore, they must put themselves in positions where they could use *their* breath to swell the blast. But the political standpoint is not that of the present work; therefore, we must ignore all these gentlemen, whether at Oxford or Cambridge or elsewhere, and return to those at Cambridge who were, *quâ* Churchmen, conscientious Nonjurors.

The first who claim our notice are, of course, the celebrated *socii ejecti* of St. John's College, some of whom were ejected after the Revolution, and some after the accession of George I. The history of these memorable deprivations is interesting, among other reasons because it illustrates a fact already noticed—namely, that residents in a University were not so much forced to show their hands as those who were settled in parochial cures. An indisputable authority writes:

> The true account of the ejection [the second, in 1716–7] is this: The Statutes require the Fellows, as soon as they are of

that standing, to take the B.D. degree; so that after the Revolution, twenty-four of the Fellows not coming into the oath of allegiance, and the statutes requiring them to commence B.D., they were constrained to part with their Fellowships. As to those who had taken that degree before the Revolution, there was nothing to eject them upon till their refusal of the Abjuration Oath exacted on the accession of George I.[1]

In other words, there were some who retained their fellowships at least a quarter of a century longer than they would have been able to retain any benefice. In several instances the very same individuals who continued to live at Cambridge and to retain their fellowships had been compelled to give up all preferments outside the University. The natural but whimsical result was that at St. John's College the seniors, *quâ* Nonjurors, were the juniors, and the juniors the seniors. There is no doubt that the master of the college at the time of the Revolution, Dr. Humphry Gower, though he took the oaths himself, had, to say the least, 'a reserved kindness' for the Nonjurors, and was most unwilling to proceed to extremities against them. 'He was suspected,' we are told, 'of favouring the Nonjurors.' Narcissus Luttrell records in his Diary: '25 July, 1693.—A Mandamus is sealed and sent to Dr. Gower, Master of St. John's

[1] *History of the College of St. John the Evangelist, Cambridge*, by Tho. Baker, B.D., ejected Fellow; edited for the Syndics of the University Press, by John E. B. Mayor, part ii. p. 1010. See also, *The History of St. John's College, Cambridge* (*College Histories*), by J. Bass Mullinger, Esq., pp. 215–6. Mr. Bass Mullinger makes the number of ejections fewer than the popular historians do, and there is no doubt that he is right; for he is a far better authority than they are; and moreover, he has kindly given to the present writer the following explanation, which is conclusive: 'The evidence on which the statement rests is given by Dr. Lunn in an Appendix to Stukeley's *Correspondence*, printed by the Surtees Society in 1882; and more fully in his *Memoir of Caleb Parnham*. He there gives the Fellowship List in 1693 complete, the names of those who were to be ejected being marked with a cross; this, he implies, is taken from the List preserved in the Record Office.' The names of all the ejected will be found at the end of this work.

Colledge in Cambridge, to turn out 20 Fellows of that Colledge refusing to take the oaths.'[1] Dr. Gower resisted both this and a second mandamus on different pleas; he was a friend and correspondent of several Nonjurors, but our business is not with their sympathisers, but with the Nonjurors themselves, and the first place among these *socii ejecti* must certainly be given to

Thomas Baker (1656–1740). He belonged to an ancient family in the county of Durham, which had long been distinguished for its loyalty, and was educated at Durham School until the age of sixteen, when he proceeded to St. John's College, Cambridge. This was his home, with only three years' interval, for the rest of his long life; in other words, he was an inmate of St. John's for no less than sixty-five years. He became successively scholar and fellow, and, having received Holy Orders, continued to reside at Cambridge until he was appointed, by Bishop Crewe, rector of Long Newton in his native county. He was for a time in great favour with the bishop, and was thought to be on the high road to further preferments, the rich living of Sedgefield and a golden prebend in Durham Cathedral being talked of for him. But an alliance between two such very different men as Lord Crewe and Thomas Baker could not last long: the one was all for interest, the other all for principle. When the star of King James II. was in the ascendant, who could bow down to him more subserviently than Bishop Crewe? When it was on the decline, who could desert him more readily? Baker took just the opposite line; he threw away all chance of preferment from Bishop Crewe by distinctly refusing to read King James's Declaration of Indulgence when the bishop required him as his

[1] See Additions to Cole's *Life of Humphrey Gower*, 24th Master, in Baker's *History of St. John's College*, pp. 988–98.

chaplain to do so in the episcopal chapel at Auckland. But he thought the deposition (as he would have called it) of King James equally illegal, and therefore he clung to him in his adversity, though he had resisted him in his prosperity, resigned his living in 1690[1] because he would not take the new oaths, and returned to Cambridge, which he never left more. As he had taken his B.D. degree just before the Revolution (1688), there was nothing to deprive him of his fellowship, and he retained it for many years longer. Some say that he was not interfered with through the intervention of 'a great man' (the Earl of Derby). But surely there was no need of any intervention; all who had taken the B.D. degree were safe from interference. He employed his ample leisure in amassing vast stores of varied learning, which were always at the service of all who desired to profit by them, whether they agreed with his religious opinions or not. He helped, in one way or another, John Walker in his 'Sufferings of the Clergy,' Bishop Burnet in his 'History of the Reformation,' John Strype, a personal friend, in many parts of his works, especially in his Lives of Parker and Whitgift; John Smith, of Durham, in his edition of Bede's 'Ecclesiastical History'; Samuel Knight

[1] In Dyer's *History of the University of Cambridge*, ii. 250–1, there is 'A Letter of Mr. Baker's, addressed to a Friend, on his resigning his Living,' which is so characteristic of the man, that an extract must be inserted: 'I must desire you once more to return my humble thanks to my Lord [Bishop Crewe], as for all his favours, so particularly, that my living has been reserved to me so long; and that my Lord may not suffer by it, I have nothing further to desire, only this, that my Lord would now dispose of it. I am very sensible of his Lordship's favour, and with how much goodness I have been treated in the whole affair, and therefore I do now part with it with as much thankfulness as I did receive it. I am not desirous to know my successor; whoever my Lord thinks fit to succeed me, shall be acceptable to me, and I shall not only be in charity with him, but shall have a friendship for him; and if anything further be required of me, to make the living more easy to him, I shall be ready to do it upon the least intimation of his Lordship's pleasure.'

in his 'Life of Erasmus,' Hilkiah Bedford in his edition of the 'Life of John Barwick'; Brown Willis, Ralph Thoresby, Thomas Hearne in their antiquarian, and John Anstis in his heraldic works; Francis Peck in his 'Desiderata Curiosa,' Conyers Middleton in his 'Dissertation on the Origin of Printing,' John Tanner in his edition of his brother Bishop Thomas Tanner's 'Notitia Monastica,' Zachary Grey in his 'Strictures on Neal's History of the Puritans,' Father Courayer in his defence of our English ordinations, Archbishop Wake in his 'State of the Gallican Church,' Bishop White Kennett in several of his publications, and probably Dr. Rawlinson in his projected 'History of Eton College.' Most of them express in their prefaces their obligations to him, and Wake and Kennett strove to repay these obligations in a substantial way, the former by offering to present any one of his friends whom he chose to name, as he could not accept preferment himself, to a living of two hundred pounds a year (a considerable sum in those days), the other by reserving for him his best pieces of preferment in case he should be induced to take the oaths. That event seemed at one time by no means impossible. Baker was a Nonjuror of the type of Ken and Frampton, not that of Turner and Hickes. He had not the faintest inclination to disturb the government either in Church or State. With Jacobites *quâ* Jacobites he had no connection whatever, and on the 'Church point' as well as the 'State point' he thoroughly agreed with those Nonjurors who, like William Law, did not separate from what used to be called 'the established worship.' 'My principle,' he writes to Hearne quite frankly, 'is not so high as you may imagine. I hold communion with the Established Church; the new communion I do not understand.'[1] With him

[1] See *Reliquiæ Hearnianæ*, iii. 61.

it was simply a personal matter of conscience. Having taken the oath of allegiance to one king, he could not conscientiously take it to another. When King James died he was half inclined to comply; but then the wretched Abjuration Oath was enjoined, and that blocked the way. When this oath was re-enacted and more strictly enforced after the Rebellion of 1715, he forfeited his fellowship rather than take it. He was just the sort of man for whom such endowments as fellowships were specially designed. 'Learned leisure' was what he knew how to employ so well, not merely for his own enlightenment, but for that of innumerable others; and to him emphatically applies the righteously indignant protest of Professor Mayor against 'this outrage so abhorrent to the professed principles of its authors' of ejecting men who 'had sinned, not by denying, but merely by declining to affirm the omnipotence of parliament to dispense with oaths.'[1] Baker himself felt some soreness at the loss of his fellowship, which he never quite overcame. It was not so much the loss of income; he had still a small patrimony, which, with occasional supplements, sufficed for his simple wants; in fact, he was 'passing rich on forty pounds a year'—that was literally the exact sum. But the ignominy of the ejection galled him, and he showed a dignified resentment by ever afterwards describing himself as *socius ejectus*—'a silent appeal' (once again to quote Professor Mayor) 'from Philip drunk to Philip sober.'[2] He laid, indeed, the blame at the wrong door when he thought his old friend, Dr. Jenkin, then Master of St. John's, might have saved him the ignominy There is something very touching in the superscription over a letter from Dr. Jenkin addressed to 'Mr. Baker,

[1] 'To the Reader,' p. ix. Preface to the Edition of the *Life of Ambrose Bonwicke*, by his Father. [2] *Ibid.*

fellow of St. John's': 'I was so then; I little thought it should be by him that I am now no fellow; but God is just, and I am a sinner.'[1] It really, however, was Dr. Jenkin's misfortune, not his fault, that he had to execute the sentence against an old friend whom he esteemed and loved. It was a peculiarly ungracious task, because for twenty years Jenkin had held the same opinions as Baker, and had suffered, like him, the loss of all his preferments outside Cambridge. But he had submitted, and in 1711 had accepted the mastership of the college; and he was now bound to do his duty in that capacity; for peremptory 'notice came from above' that the non-taking of the oath by the fellows, of whom Baker was one, could be overlooked no longer. The college did its best for one of whom it had every reason to be proud. Baker was permitted to retain his rooms in college as a 'commoner-master,' and did retain them until his death nearly a quarter of a century later. It is sad to have to relate that he suffered the penalty of old age in outliving his generation, or, perhaps it would be more correct to say, of living into a generation in which his old Church principles were temporarily out of fashion; for there are few with any pretensions to be Church people who would not now sympathise with Baker rather than with those who in his old age regarded him as an anachronism. The following passage occurs in Cole's Life of Dr. W. S. Powell, in the 'History of St. John's College':

> Dr. W. S. Powell, elected Master of S^t. Johns in 1765,[2] is said to have held Mr. Baker in the most sovereign contempt, insomuch as not to bear with common patience that any one should call him, as most people were disposed to do, the worthy

[1] See *History of St. John's College*, p. 1010.

[2] That would be twenty-five years after Baker's death; but it will be seen that the master reflected the opinion of others who knew, and may very likely himself have remembered, Baker.

Mr. Baker, which would immediately raise his choler, make him fly out into a passion, and abuse him, and call his MS. History of St. John's a collection of lyes. Mr. Baker might have had his failings, and at an extreme old age, and after an expulsion from his fellowship in a society in which he chose to spend his days, perhaps might be peevish towards the decline of life; especially as new manners and new opinions, totally different from his own, might disgust him upon occasion. But his integrity and veracity I will never call in question. Also Dr. Heberden said he used to be peevish and out of humour with people's jostling against, and crowding upon him as he came out of chapel; natural enough in an old man, who had been used to decenter manners. Dr. Heberden was a most decent-behaved, but vehement party man, strong against subscription to Articles and Liturgy; so that, no doubt, Mr. Baker's strict adherence to old Church of England principles might early prejudice Dr. Heberden against him, who had a more enlarged way of thinking upon these matters. . . . I make no sort of doubt but that the same kind of prejudice, though not exactly similar, acted in the breast of Dr. Powell, who had a strange mixture and complication of opinions, as averse to those of Mr. Baker as light to darkness (pp. 1051–2).

But Baker's character and learning were appreciated by some whom one would have hardly expected to do so. One is not surprised to find Hearne writing that 'his goodness and humanity are as charming to those who have the happiness of his conversation as his learning is profitable to his correspondents,'[1] and accounting for the greater help which Dr. Rawlinson found at Cambridge than at Oxford in his investigations about the Nonjurors by the fact that 'a Mr. Baker is to be met with but in few places';[2] nor to find Zachary Grey describing his 'most worthy friend Mr. Tho. Baker' as 'a person universally esteemed for his great knowledge in almost all the branches of literature, and who, as he is the most knowing in our English history and antiquitys, so he is

[1] *Reliquiæ Hearnianæ*, ii. 313. [2] *Ibid.* iii. 160.

the most communicative man living' ;[1] no, nor yet to find William Whiston speaking in the highest terms of him in his Memoir; for though Whiston held most heterodox and eccentric views he was a very honest man, and tried to recognise good wherever he found it. But one really would *not* have thought Warburton and Baker to be kindred spirits, and yet Bishop Warburton writes: 'Good old Mr. Baker has been very obliging. The people of St. John's almost adore the man; for as there is much in him to esteem, much to pity, and nothing (but his Virtue and Learning) to envy, he has all the justice at present done to him, that few people of merit have till they are dead.'[2] Still less, perhaps, would one expect to find Bishop Burnet, who was not, as a rule, partial to Nonjurors, paying him elaborate compliments. Baker, on his part, is one of the very few Nonjurors who have a good word to say about Bishop Burnet.[3] And least of all would one have imagined that Horace Walpole (Earl of Orford) would have been so attracted by him as to write his biography. It is but a slight, inadequate performance, for there were sides of Baker's character with which the writer had no sympathy; but the mere fact that it was written at all speaks volumes for Baker's attractiveness. The standard biography of Baker is, of course, the 'Memoirs' compiled by Robert Masters from the papers of Zachary Grey.

The name that is most frequently coupled with Thomas Baker in connection with his college is that of *John Billers*, who, like Baker, was ejected, late in life,

[1] *An Impartial Examination of the second volume of Mr. Daniel Neal's History of the Puritans*, p. 62, note.

[2] *Warburtoniana*, in Maty's *New Review*, p. 144.

[3] See *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Thomas Baker, of St. John's College, Cambridge, from the Papers of Dr. Zachary Grey*, by Robert Masters, pp. 32–3.

from his fellowship at St. John's on January 21, 1716–7. On that fatal occasion Sir Paul Whichcote writes to Baker: 'I should have been glad to have done Mr. Billers and yourself service on any account.'[1] William Whiston says:

> Two of the Nonjurors of St. John's College, Mr. Billers and Mr. Baker, loved their religion and their country as well as any juror whatever; but having once taken an oath to King James, they could not satisfy their consciences in breaking it, whilst he lived, for any consideration whatever. These two were long my particular acquaintances; and I well remember that when King James died they began to deliberate about taking the oaths and coming into the Government, till the Abjuration Oath, unfortunate in that respect, had to be taken.[2]

And Professor Mayor quotes a passage from Reed's Diary:

> October 12, 1711.—Mr. Burrell contested with Mr. Enin, of Sydney, for the rectory of Ovington in Norfolk, and lost it by one vote (85 to 86), but Enin had two Nonjurors who voted for him, viz., Mr. Baker and Mr. Billers, and though Mr. Burrell objected against their votes and desired that the oaths might be tendered to them, yet he was overruled by Dr. Laney and Dr. Ashton.[3]

One gathers from such passages as these that Mr. Billers and Mr. Baker were kindred spirits, and were accustomed to act together. Billers was eight years the senior, and held college and university offices, which Baker never did; but he left nothing behind him to perpetuate his memory, and therefore, while his friend Baker is known to all scholars, Billers has passed into oblivion. All we know of him is that he was a native of Leicestershire, matriculated at Sidney-Sussex College in 1667, was elected fellow of St. John's in 1671, and

[1] See Masters' *Life of Baker*, p. 35. [2] *Memoirs*, p. 32.
[3] Professor Mayor's Notes to *Life of Ambrose Bonwicke*, p. 209.

Public Orator in 1681, but was deprived of the latter post in 1689 because he refused to take the oaths to William and Mary.[1] He is described by his friend's biographer as 'a truly learned and good man,'[2] and with that satisfactory character we must here leave him.

Another fellow who was ejected at the same time is more definitely brought before us owing to his connection with that wonderful young man, Ambrose Bonwicke.

Francis Roper (1642–1719) was a native of the county of Durham. He was, it will be seen, considerably older than the two last mentioned, and was nearing the end of his life when he was ejected. He was elected fellow in 1666, so he held his fellowship for nearly forty years, but, like Baker, he lost all other preferments at the time of the Revolution. He was collated by Bishop Gunning to the vicarage of Waterbeach, near Cambridge, in January 1677–8, became Prebendary of Ely in 1686, and in 1687, having resigned Waterbeach, was appointed rector of Northwold, in Norfolk. Refusing to take the new oaths he was deprived of his prebend and rectory in 1690, and, like Baker, remained at Cambridge for the rest of his life. He was not, as has been sometimes stated, Ambrose Bonwicke's *college* tutor, but he acted more than a father's part towards him, being, in a way, his spiritual director, medical adviser, and classical and mathematical instructor. He is the 'Mr. R.' so frequently referred to in Bonwicke's Life,[3] and the affectionate relationship between the fellow and the undergraduate forms a strange contrast to similar relationships as described by men of both Universities in the eighteenth century.

Another of the elders who were ejected in 1716–7

[1] *Annals of Cambridge*, by C. H. Cooper, and MS. book belonging to St. John's College Library.

[2] Masters' *Life of Baker*, p. 35.

[3] See *Life of Ambrose Bonwicke*, pp. 24, 55, 60, 101, and *passim*.

attained considerable reputation in his day as a writer. *Thomas Browne* (1654–1741), a Middlesex man, was entered at St. John's in January 1671–2, and admitted fellow in March 1677–8; he wrote several works, the most important of which were a 'Defence of our English Ordination against the Nag's Head Fable,' and an answer to Bishop Stillingfleet's famous discourse, 'The Unreasonableness of a New Separation.' Like many Nonjurors, he seems to have found, when he was turned out of his fellowship in his old age, a friend and patron without whose aid he would have passed his last days in penury. This friend was Sir Francis Leicester, of Nether Tabley, grandson of the famous antiquary, Peter Leicester, and ancestor of the present Lord De Tabley.

The four that have been mentioned were quiet, inoffensive men, who had not the slightest wish to disturb the Government; and the same may be presumed of the rest of the *socii ejecti* who are now little more than shadows to us. But among those who were ejected from their fellowships at St. John's twenty-six years earlier there was at least one who held a very prominent position both as a Nonjuror and a Jacobite, and this will be the best place in which to trace his career.

Hilkiah Bedford (1663–1724) was of Lincolnshire extraction, his grandfather being a Quaker who migrated from Sibsey, near Boston, to London, where he settled as a stationer. His father was a mathematical instrument maker in Hozier Lane, near West Smithfield, where Hilkiah was born, July 23, 1663. He was educated at Bradley, in Suffolk, and in 1679 proceeded to St. John's College, Cambridge, where he was elected the first scholar on the foundation of his maternal grandfather, William Plat. He took his B.A. degree in 1683, and was elected fellow of St. John's, 1685. He was instituted, possibly

through the influence of his kind friend, Heneage Finch, second Earl of Winchilsea, to the small living of Whittering, in Northants, in 1687. At the Revolution, refusing to take the oaths, he lost both his fellowship and his living, and had recourse to tuition, acting as travelling tutor to young gentlemen and keeping a boarding-house for Westminster scholars, which was so successful that he made a considerable fortune. He identified himself with the more advanced section of the Nonjurors, being perhaps the closest and most confidential friend of Hickes, who bequeathed to him all his manuscripts and letters, and copies of all his printed works.[1] It is said that Hickes intimated his wish that Bedford should write his Life if anyone did, and that Bedford commenced the task but never completed it. He was also a friend of Thomas Smith, who gave the following particulars about him to Hearne in 1710:

To satisfy your curiosity about what M^r. Bedford has published, I know but of two things, w^ch hee hath done lately, & they are both Translations, of the 'History of Oracles, and the Continuation of it,' out of French: for the exactness and elegance of w^ch I refer you to D^r. Hickes's account of it, printed before y^e *History*; but the *Prefaces* shew him to be a man of good judgm^t & learning. Other little things, w^ch hee has published, his great modesty will not suffer him to owne. Hee has spent several yeares, since the Revolution, in France and Italy in the company of young Gentlemen committed to his conduct: w^ch trust hee discharged with great care & fidelity to the great satisfaction of their Parents and Relations. Hee is a gentleman of an excellent understanding, & steddy in his principles, & to say no more of him, is very well qualified for the work, w^ch hee has undertaken.[2]

[1] In the MS. book belonging to St. John's Library there is 'A Catalogue of the MSS. papers committed to the trust of Mr. Hilkiah Bedford by Dr. George Hickes;' they are eighty-seven in number, and many of them bear directly upon Nonjuring subjects.

[2] Hearne's *Collections*, ii. 346.

Smith also told Hearne that Bedford was 'one of the most zealous Nonjurors in England,' that 'he instilled good Principles into the young men he travelled with in Foreign Countries, and brought them home compleat Gentlemen and Scholars,' and that he was 'an admirable Scholar himself,' 'which character of his,' he adds, 'I have heard also from two other very learned men.'[1] Bedford became one of Hearne's constant correspondents. The only work bearing on the Nonjuring question that I have seen attributed to him is an able defence of his friend Hickes, entitled 'A Seasonable and Modest Apology in behalf of Dr. G. Hickes and other Nonjurors in a Letter to Rev. T. Wise on the occasion of his Visitation at Canterbury, June 1, 1710,' in which he pleads touchingly and most justly 'the zeal which the Nonjurors have shown for our common mother the Church of England, and how they have been her constant Champions against her adversaries of all sorts since the Revolution.' He might have appealed to his own conduct as an instance, for his own pen was chiefly devoted to the defence of Christianity as held by the Church of England generally, and not to the Nonjuring cause in particular.

But, strangely enough, the book which made Hilkiah Bedford best known was *not* one of his own writing. In 1713 there appeared a little work entitled 'The Hereditary Right of the Crown of England asserted: The History of the Succession since the Conquest cleared: And the True English Constitution Vindicated from the Misrepresentation of Dr. Higden's View and Defence. By a Gentleman.' It was only one out of many answers to Dr. Higden, but it created a greater sensation than any of them. Many efforts were made to find out who the 'Gentleman' was; and they seized the wrong 'gentle-

[1] *Collections*, iii. 39.

man' after all. It must have been the critical time at which the book was published that caused it to create so much alarm, for it is not so violent as some of the answers to Higden which had appeared previously. It is simply a *résumé* of English history from the Norman Conquest downwards, traversing Higden's historical views at every point, touching slightly upon Jewish and Roman history, and examining Grotius's exposition of the text 'Render unto Cæsar, &c.' But the moral of the book is plain, and it is not surprising that it should have created alarm at that very critical juncture. It was well known that Queen Anne's health was failing—and *après*? Was the Hanover succession to be carried out, or was the rightful heir to be sent for? The book gave no doubtful answer to this question. Hereditary right was the only right recognised by the Constitution of England, which acknowledged no such thing as a king *de facto* and not *de jure*. The very first words of the Introduction showed the gist of the book:

> The first time that the duty of paying allegiance to Powers in possession began to be taught publicly in this kingdom was during the Usurpations which succeeded the death of King Charles I. In all former Revolutions the Princes who got possession of the Crown claimed it by some right, and never insisted on Possession as a right. But the Rump Parliament and Cromwell, and the following Usurpers, having no tolerable Pretence to any claim of right, their Friends were reduced to a necessity of pleading Possession as a right to Obedience.

This suggested an analogy between the Revolution settlement, which secured the Hanoverian succession, and the Rebellion, the violent feeling against which had by no means yet subsided. If hereditary right was the only right to the Crown there could be no question, since the warming-pan story was exploded, where that right lay. The book, in short, obviously meant Jacobitism

pure and simple, and it is no wonder that it was eagerly taken up by the friends of the Chevalier and distributed gratuitously far and wide;[1] nor, on the other hand, that its author was eagerly sought for by the constituted authorities to give an account of himself. The search resulted in tracing the delivery of the manuscript to the printer to Hilkiah Bedford, who was seized, tried at the Guildhall, and found guilty of 'writing, printing, and publishing a seditious libel.' His punishment was a severe one: he was condemned to pay a fine of one thousand marks, to suffer three years' imprisonment, and at the expiration of the period to find sureties for his good behaviour during life. A gratuitous insult was added—viz., that he should appear in court with a paper on his hat, expressing the crime and the judgment. But here the good feeling of the Queen, her respect for the Church, and possibly also a little latent sympathy with the cause, stepped in, and by her Majesty's express warrant Bedford was spared the senseless outrage. His fine also is said to have been remitted; but he had to suffer the full length of the imprisonment, and never recovered from its effects. Great sympathy was shown towards him. Among others Lord Weymouth sent him 100*l.* by the hands of his chaplain, who, oddly enough, was the real author of the book. But if Bedford had not been chivalrous he might have compromised at least three other people besides himself: (1) George Harbin, the author; (2) Theophilus Downes, the writer of the Introduction, as already noticed; and (3) Robert Nelson, who in conjunction with Bedford revised all the matter for the press. It was, indeed, indignantly denied both in the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries that Nelson

[1] See on this point Mr. Lecky's *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i. ch. i. p. 147.

had anything to do with the matter; but Mr. Secretan, his biographer, has shown conclusively that he had, and there is nothing in the least degree inconsistent with his general conduct and character in so doing. Nelson ceased to be a Nonjuror,[1] but he never ceased to be a Jacobite, nor even modified his views on that subject. Bedford came out of prison a broken man; but in 1720–1, January 25, he was consecrated, together with Ralph Taylor, a Nonjuring bishop in the Oratory in Gray's Inn, by Bishops Spinckes, Hawes, and Gandy. He was thus one of the two first bishops who were consecrated after the division in the Nonjuring camp, at which I have ventured to draw the line of demarcation between the earlier and the later Nonjurors. On that principle he would naturally come in among the later, but he really belongs to the earlier. His life-work was over before he became a bishop; he took no part in any consecration, and no part in the unhappy controversy about the Usages. There is little doubt that he would have been consecrated before had it not been for his imprisonment; for he was the man in whom Hickes, the universally recognised head of the Nonjurors after the death of the deprived Fathers, had the greatest confidence. Like most men of strong views he succeeded in impressing them upon others; and members of his family will be found among the latest with whom this volume deals when the Nonjuring party had almost reached the vanishing point.

The reader will probably now wish to know something about the real author of the book which brought poor Mr. Bedford into trouble. *George Harbin* (1665?–1744) is said to have been a nephew of Bishop Turner, of

[1] Or rather a non-complier, for there was no need for him to take any oaths.

Ely, and also, oddly enough, to have been, in early youth, a private pupil of a very different person, Bishop Kidder. It is certain that he graduated at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, in 1686, and then, having received Holy Orders, became chaplain to Bishop Turner, whose example he followed at the Revolution in refusing to take the new oaths. His connection with Turner probably introduced him to Turner's lifelong friend, Ken, who wrote to Lord Weymouth on Harbin's behalf:

> The Bp. of E. mentions to me one M^r. Harbin, who was his owne Chaplaine heretofore, an excellent Scholar, and as far as I could observe, of a brisk and cheerfull temper. However, I was unwilling to engage your Lordshippe to take him without a previous trial, and I have told y^e Bp. y^t your Lordshippe should make Experiment of him, for a quarter of a yeare, before he fix'd in your family.[1]

The 'experiment' was eminently successful; and Harbin was established as chaplain and librarian at Longleat, and remained there certainly until the death of the first Lord Weymouth in 1714, if not longer.

There are several letters of Ken to, and about, Harbin, and all give us the impression of his being the quiet, learned student, not the firebrand to raise a conflagration by spreading treasonable matter. This impression is confirmed from other sources. His name frequently occurs in the correspondence between Thomas Smith and Hearne, and generally in connection with some literary subject, in which both evidently regard him as an authority. Baker's biographer says that Harbin was 'thought to have been as well acquainted with the History and Antiquities of England as any man whatsoever;'[2] Anthony Wood records with great complacency

[1] Plumptre, ii. 107.

[2] *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Thomas Baker, of St. John's College, Cambridge*, p. 23, note.

(September 25, 1695) that he had met at dinner 'at Dr. Charlet's one Harbin, a clergyman and a Cambridge man by education, sometime chaplain to Dr. Turner, but a Nonjuror and in a lay habit,' who 'was desirous to see him,' 'complimented him much, told him of severall matters in his book'—evidently thinking that such a man's approbation in literary matters was something worth having;[1] and in the account of his death nearly fifty years later he was described in an obituary notice as having been 'a Person of uncommon Learning, admirably versed in all Parts of our English History and true ancient Constitution.'[2] Add to this the negative evidence that his name never appears in connection with Nonjuring services, Nonjuring consecrations, or Nonjuring internal disputes, and it will be admitted that Harbin's *rôle* was that of the student, not of the agitator; and that it was at least as much on historical as on political grounds that he wrote the work which made so great a sensation. Indeed, it was not the first work he wrote on the subject. Three years before (1710) he published 'The English Constitution fully stated, with some Animadversions on Mr. Higden's Mistakes about it. In a Letter to a Friend.' Like many other Nonjurors he ended his days in London, for we learn from the notice quoted above that 'he died in a very advanced age at his house in King Street, Soho,' on September 20, 1744. Had he come more to the front he would have been a link between the earlier and the later Nonjurors; but, as it is, he belongs exclusively to the earlier, for his prominence was exclusively in the first, not in the last part of his life. The name of George Harbin suggests that of another and much older Cam-

[1] Wood's *Life and Times* (Oxf. Hist. Soc.), iii. 490.

[2] *London Evening Post*, for September 20, 1744, quoted in *Notes and Queries* (8th Series), vol. i., March 12, 1892, p. 214.

bridge man, Francis Brokesby, who was at Shottesbrooke what Harbin was at Longleat.

Francis Brokesby (1637–1714) was a native of Leicestershire. He was a graduate and a fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and in 1670 became rector of Rowley, near Hull. There he married and held the living until 1690, when he was deprived for refusing the oaths. He had a high reputation for learning and piety, but would probably have passed into oblivion had he not become associated with the Shottesbrooke group. In 1706 he succeeded Mr. Gilbert as chaplain to Mr. Cherry and Mr. Dodwell, and for five or six years was an honoured inmate of Shottesbrooke Park. He became the confidential friend of Dodwell, Cherry, Hearne, and the guests at Shottesbrooke, such as Robert Nelson, whom he helped in his work on the 'Festivals and Fasts'; his name frequently occurs in Mr. Secretan's 'Life of Nelson,' and in 'Hearne's 'Collections,' and it is quite clear from these and other sources that he was no servile dependent, but on terms of perfect equality with his benefactors. From his correspondence with Hearne we gather that he was a man of wide and varied tastes and accomplishments; Hearne consults him on all sorts of subjects, literary and antiquarian, and always receives his advice and information with the greatest respect until he published his 'Life of Dodwell,' which Hearne regards, with justice, as a very inadequate performance. Brokesby belonged to the most moderate section of the Nonjurors, yearned for their return to the National Church, and heartily joined the movement of Cherry, Dodwell, and Nelson in 1710, which was the first step in the direction of putting a stop to the Nonjuring separation. There is an interesting MS. letter in St. John's College Library from Brokesby to Wagstaffe, from which it appears that

Wagstaffe had asked Brokesby to administer the Holy Communion to him, not knowing that he had returned to the National Church; Brokesby informs him that he had done so, but is quite ready, 'if you are pleased to accept of me as here represented'; but it is added in the MS.: 'N.B. Upon this letter Mr. Wagstaffe withdrew his request, and died without the Sacrament.' The letter is dated 'Hinckley, August 29, 1712,' and Wagstaffe's reply, 'October 17, 1712.' Brokesby died at Hinckley two years later.

We come next to two or three Cambridge Nonjurors of a different type.

Samuel Grascome, or Grascomb (1641–1709 *circa*), was born and educated at Coventry until his admission as a sizar, in 1661, at Magdalene College, Cambridge, where he graduated in 1666. In 1680 he was instituted to the rectory of Stourmouth, in Kent, which he held until 1690, when he was deprived for refusing to take the oaths. He cast in his lot, heart and soul, with the Nonjurors, and acted as officiating minister at one of the most noted of their oratories, that in Scroop Court, Holborn, just opposite to St. Andrew's Church, where Hickes and Gandy afterwards officiated. Whatever else Grascome lacked he certainly did not lack courage—nor, it may be added, brains. The ablest and most formidable opponent of the Nonjurors was perhaps Edward Stillingfleet. William Sherlock may have equalled him in point of ability, but then Stillingfleet had the advantage over Sherlock in not being weighted with the unpleasant consciousness of having once been on the other side, and of having turned right about face. At any rate, one of the most telling, as it was one of the earliest, works in favour of taking the oaths and complying with the new order, was Stillingfleet's pamphlet (it fills only

forty-two pages), 'A Discourse concerning the Unreasonableness of a New Separation, on account of the Oaths, with an Answer to the History of Passive Obedience as it relates to them.' The 'History of Passive Obedience' was written by Collier, who was well able to take care of himself; but, as Stillingfleet did not confine himself to Collier's subject, there was room for another writer, and indeed the critical circumstances of the time required it. Stillingfleet's pamphlet is dated 'October 15, 1689'—that is, some time before the actual separation had taken place, and the writer evidently anticipates that it might still be avoided. But that would be fatal to Grascome's position, so he wrote at once a 'Brief Answer,' &c. Then Dr. Williams, afterwards Bishop of Chichester, rushed into the fray, publishing in 1691 'A Vindication of [Stillingfleet's] Discourse,' and Grascome rejoined the same year in 'A Reply to a Vindication,' &c. Williams was an experienced and adroit controversialist; so Grascome had two strong opponents on his hands. He writes fiercely, but considering that he had sacrificed everything for conscience' sake, while his opponent was skipping on from one preferment to another, there was some little excuse for his indignation at Williams's suggestion that though the Nonjurors could not take the oath, they should not make a separation, but continue in communion with the National Church.

> When [replies Grascome] you joyn with those who make this unjust Deprivation, when you take our Churches, our Flocks, our Livelihoods, and suffer us not to exercise our Ministry, where you have the Profit of it, unless we will do it to the dissatisfaction of our Consciences. Do you complain that we do not maintain communion with you? If we were in fault in the case, yet Modesty (if any be left you), and the ill usage we have from your party, might make you hold your peace [p. 16].

Grascome is a typical representative of the extreme section of the Nonjurors, and even in that early stage of the dispute had not only drawn the sword, but thrown away the scabbard. He declares distinctly

> that whosoever shall be put into the place of the deprived Bishops are not to be esteemed Bishops, nor ought either Clergy or people to regard them, but to adhere firmly to their former true Bishops; that whosoever shall ordain such, or endeavour to place them there, make themselves criminals, and liable to ecclesiastical censure, and that they and all their adherents are schismatics [p. 24].

He did not tone down his sentiments as years went on, for in 1693 he published a work on 'The Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical,' in which he contends that 'all who either revolt from or deny the Supremacy or Independency of their Lawful Sovereign, and transfer their Allegiance to any Foreign or Usurped Power are *ipso facto* excommunicated by the Second Canon.' John Kettlewell wrote almost simultaneously on a similar subject; and Kettlewell's biographer, Francis Lee, contrasts the two books, and says: 'By the conclusions of Grascome on the 2nd Canon, I do not find yet that any one was brought over to the Nonjurors by the terrors of *ipso facto* excommunication. The milder and softer method of Kettlewell succeeded far better.'[1] In a work entitled 'Solomon and Abiathar,' which appeared a little earlier (1692), the anonymous writer (probably Samuel Hill, Archdeacon of Wells, a High Churchman) suggests that the Nonjurors might join in the 'immoral prayers' because James and William were not enemies. Grascome replied in 'Two Letters written to the Author of . . . Solomon and Abiathar, &c.,' intimating that King James may yet claim his rights; 'and,' he adds, 'I am apt to think that your

[1] *Compleat Works of John Kettlewell, with Life* prefixed, i. 133.

little ambitious Dutch saviour would think no man in the world so much his enemy as he that demands three kingdoms from him' (p. 133). Grascome published his pamphlets either anonymously or simply under the initials 'S. G.'; otherwise he would probably have come into trouble before, but in 1696 he escaped no longer. In that year the people were violently excited on the currency question, almost to the point of rebellion; and Grascome fomented the popular excitement by writing a pamphlet entitled 'An Account of the Proceedings in the House of Commons in relation to the Recovering of the Clipt Money and Falling the Price of Guineas.' The House voted that the pamphlet was 'false, scandalous, and seditious, and destructive of the freedom and liberties of Parliament,' ordered it to be burned by the common hangman, and petitioned the King to offer a reward for the discovery of the author.[1] Grascome by a sort of accident escaped prosecution; but he was evidently regarded as a 'suspect person,' and was obliged to lie low. We hear nothing more of him except through his publications, which were numerous. The last of them was 'An Answer to some Queries sent by a Roman Catholic to a Divine of the Church,' which Hickes published in his 'Second Collection of Controversial Tracts,' 1710, having found it, he says, in Grascome's own handwriting among his other papers after his death. This fixes approximately the date of Grascome's death. It must have been before 1710, but presumably only a little before; for he was certainly living in 1707, in which year he wrote his last work, with the suggestive title of 'Schism Triumphant, or a Rejoinder to a Reply,' &c. His oppo-

[1] See article on 'Grascome, Samuel,' in the *Dictionary of National Biography*; and Narcissus Luttrell's *Brief Relation of State Affairs*, &c., pp. 154 and 534.

nent was the aged Francis Tallents, one of the Nonconformist ministers who had been ejected at the Restoration, and who had written in 1705 'A Short History of Schism,' which Grascome answered.

Matthias Earbery (1690–1740) was another Nonjuror of the combative type. He was the son of a clergyman at Hoveton, in Norfolk, under whom he was educated until his admission as a sizar at St. John's College, Cambridge. He was in his early manhood a friend of Thomas Brett, the elder, and probably his neighbour in Kent; for he writes to Brett, in 1720, reminding him of the time 'when' (he says) 'you was a formal Jurant and held a living in Romney Marsh,' and 'when you invited me over (I cannot say disputed me) into the Nonjurant Church, where your Learnedship assured me only salvation was to be had;'[1] and in the same year he writes to another opponent on the same subject (the Usages): 'If I had not been engaged in a correspondence with Dr. Brett, who claimed the respect of an old friend, I had sent you a few lines much sooner.'[2] He was curate of Aylesford in the same county, but in a different part of it from Brett's home, and then became incumbent of Neatishead in his native county. It would probably be at the time of the enforcement of the Abjuration Oath after the Rebellion of 1715 that he, like Brett, became a formal Nonjuror. He certainly was one in 1717, for we find in the Rawlinson MSS. among the Nonjuring ordinations: '1717, June 4, Robert Islip, ordained Deacon in Mr. Earbury's Chapel in Bedford Court, Holbourn by Mr. Gandy,' and '1717, June 13, Robert Nixon and Robert Islip were ordained Preists by Mr. Gandy, and Mr. John

[1] *Reflections upon Modern Fanaticism. In two Letters to Dr. Brett*, by Matthias Earbery, Presbyter of the Church of England.

[2] Letter to the Author of a late Pamphlet, ironically entitled *Mr. Leslie's Defence*, by M. E., &c.

Lindsay Deacon in Mr. Earbury's Chapell in Bedford Court, Holbourne.' It is not at all inconsistent with this that a year later (1718) Earbery still describes himself in print as 'Vicar of Neatsheard in Norfolk;' for though deprived he would still regard himself as the canonical vicar, and would claim the title on the same principle on which Thomas Ken continued to sign himself 'Tho. B. and W.' long after his deprivation. His death is thus announced in 'The Gentleman's Magazine': '1740, October. Rev. Mr. Earbery, a Nonjuror and author of several political writings.' It is correct enough to describe him as a political writer; but he himself would certainly have claimed to be a theological one, and to have treated politics only as they affected theology; the two subjects were unhappily so mixed up in the eighteenth century that it is impossible to disentangle the one from the other. Like Grascome, he wrote on a great variety of subjects, and sometimes, it must be owned, with great bitterness. He deals his blows upon enemies from all quarters; William Whiston, White Kennett, Nathanael Marshall, Benjamin Hoadly, Thomas Fleetwood, and Burnet all fall under his lash; but against none of his enemies does he use stronger language than against his own Nonjuring friends, who differed from him only in little points of ritual, as will appear in a later chapter. A long list of his writings is given in a note to Hearne's 'Reliquiæ Anglicanæ' (vol. ii. pp. 143–4), and the curious may find most of them in the library of the British Museum. His answer to Bishop Hoadly suffers sadly by comparison with Law's famous 'Three Letters to the Bishop of Bangor.' The latter are not only far more powerful and polished, but the writer does not give himself away, as Earbery does, by his violence. His most famous work is one entitled 'The History of the Clemency of our English

Monarchs, as compared with several Matters which have lately occurred in this Kingdom, by M. E.' (1717). The 'several Matters' practically resolve themselves into one, viz. the hanging of the rebels after the battle of Preston; and severe reflections are passed on the cruelty of the Government in contrast with the clemency of English monarchs on previous occasions. This was accounted a seditious libel, and Earbery was prosecuted for it by the Attorney-General, fled the kingdom, and was outlawed.[1] The sentence of outlawry was reversed in the Court of King's Bench, December 2, 1725, and Earbery appears to have returned to England and died here.

There are yet two other Cambridge Nonjurors who brought themselves within the arm of the law.

Laurence Howell (1664?–1720) graduated from Jesus College, Cambridge, in 1684, and became master of Epping School and curate of Eastwick, in Herts.[2] He refused the Abjuration Oath when it was tendered to him in 1708, cast in his lot with the Nonjurors, and was 'ordained Priest by Dr. Hickes, October 2, 1712.' He is said to have composed the dying speech delivered by William Paul on the scaffold at his execution in 1716. But Thomas Deacon distinctly told John Byrom that *he* composed the speech,[3]

[1] A full account of the matter from a hostile point of view in the *Weekly Journal*, in 1720, is quoted by Dr. Doran in his *London in the Jacobite Times*, i. 409. In the same year (1720) Earbery published from France, *A Vindication of the Clemency of our English Monarchs, with Reflections on the late Proceedings against the Author*, which gives us the other side of the question.

[2] In the Kettlewell List he is described as 'Curate of Estwich, Suffolk,' and, as there is no such place, it has been doubted whether he was curate anywhere. It was suggested that Eastwick in Herts 'may be meant.' But there is no 'may be' in the matter. It is settled by Howell himself, who in his 'Collections for Cambridge' (Rawlinson MSS. B 281) places among the Nonjurors in the Diocese of London, 'Laur. Howell, Cur. of Eastwick.'

[3] *Private Journal and Literary Remains of John Byrom* (Chetham Society), i. 178.

and internal evidence bears him out, for both the style and matter remind one much more of Deacon than of Howell. There is no doubt, however, that Howell was a thoroughgoing Jacobite, who spoke, or rather wrote, his mind quite freely, and suffered severely for so doing. His general, and far more important, writings will be described in a future chapter. All we are now concerned with is a pamphlet entitled 'The Case of Schism in the Church of England fairly stated,' which was printed in 1718 for private circulation only; but as a thousand copies were found at Redmayne the printer's, it was presumed that they were intended for gratuitous distribution. He was consequently tried at the Old Bailey, found guilty, and sentenced to be whipped, to stand in the pillory, to have his gown stripped off, to be fined 500*l.*, and to be imprisoned for three years. He did not survive his imprisonment, but died in Newgate on July 19, 1720. The main thesis of the pamphlet for which he suffered so severely was only a re-echo of what even the gentle Kettlewell, to say nothing of Leslie and others, had contended for quite as strongly, viz. that the compliers, not the Nonjurors, were entirely responsible for the schism, and that the 'case of schism' was *un*fairly stated in any other way. But his incidental reflections on the established order both in Church and State were such as would be sure to bring him into trouble.

> The odious name of separatist [he writes] belongs to those who separated from the Church's true Communion in 1688 and since; and not to the chast few who for the preservation of a good conscience quitted their present support, and prospect of further promotion. These are still as much friends of the Church and enemies of schism as ever. But by the Church they understand the true old Church of England [praises it]. . . . This pure Virgin-Church, which may be said once more to be driven into the wilderness, and chiefly (O horrid!) by her

unnatural Renegade sons, the Nonjurors say is the Church to which they adhere, and from which the Complyers have separated by departing from her ancient doctrine and practice, notwithstanding they keep possession of the loyal churches from which the Nonjurors were illegally rejected. Thus began a spiritual war which on the Nonjurors' side was purely defensive, because they were driven from the Publick churches and therefore were forc'd to set up separate Oratories or Chapels. . . . They not only displaced the canonical Metropolitan, Archbishop Sancroft, but hoisted up a Subject Presbyter into his room, who had sworn canonical obedience to him, and, when God has removed him they set up another in his place as Head of their Schism. . . . In depriving their rightful King they disowned his authority. . . . Now the violation of this 2nd Canon by the Revolutionists transferring their allegiance from their lawful King to an Usurper . . . renders them *ipso facto* excommunicates; and the Nonjurors are the only true Church of England. . . . Who is ignorant of the unnatural treatment of King James 2 from his children and subjects; how his authority was trampled on, despised and denied? . . . The case is not altered now—

with much more to the same effect.

Another Cambridge Nonjuror who fell into trouble was *Martin Pinchbeck*, who graduated from Emmanuel College in 1664, and became master of the school at Butterwick, near Boston. 'Pinchbeck's Endowed School,' as it is still called, had only just been founded (1665) by a namesake, whether a relation or not I do not know, Anthony Pinchbeck. Martin Pinchbeck also acted as curate of the neighbouring village of Freiston (the living of Butterwick was annexed to Freiston in 1751, and the two have since then always gone together). At the Revolution he took the oaths to William and Mary, 'and was beneficed near Barton, in Lincolnshire,' possibly at Barrow-on-Humber. But

by reading Kettlewell's and other books, and comparing them with the performances of Sherlock, Burnet, and others on that

side, he was so wrought on as to retract. And in a publick manner one Sunday before all his parish he testified it, and his unfeigned repentance in a Recantation sermon on II. Sam. xxiv. 10, wherein he solemnly adjured the whole congregation to join with him, for the iniquity by them committed, and to return to their allegiance to their rightful and lawful king, and he prayed in express terms for King James, Queen Mary and the Prince of Wales, and read in church the Declaration of King James of 1693.[1]

By this is meant the Declaration promising some concessions to the 'Compounders,' that is, to those who stipulated that conditions should be made before James was restored, in contradistinction to the 'Non-Compounders,' who were willing that he should be restored unconditionally. Pinchbeck's action did not commend itself to some Nonjurors, who thought that he ought first to have consulted his 'rightful superiors,' while, of course, it brought him at once into collision with the ruling powers. He was seized, sent to Lincoln, tried at the Assizes, and condemned to stand in the pillory, pay a fine of 200*l.*, and remain in prison until it was paid. He, of course, also lost his living. Much sympathy was shown for him. Half the fine was remitted; efforts were made to persuade him to own that he was in fault, and the Roman Catholics offered to pay the fine if he would join them; but all was in vain, and he was reduced, one must own, through his rashness rather than his courage, to penury.

William Snatt (1645–1721) comes within the category of those Nonjuring clergymen who were caught in the meshes of the law, though he did not suffer so severely as those above-mentioned. He was the son of Edward Snatt, a master of the Free School at Southover, Lewes, the school at which the famous John Evelyn was educated

[1] *Life of Kettlewell*, prefixed to his *Compleat Works* [by F. Lee], i. 150–1.

under the elder Snatt.[1] William Snatt was born at Lewes, and educated at his father's school until his matriculation at Magdalen College, Oxford, at the close of 1660. He graduated B.A. in 1664, and having in due time received Holy Orders was appointed rector of Denton, Sussex, in 1672, Prebendary of Sutton, in Chichester Cathedral, in 1674, rector of St. Thomas's, Lewes, and vicar of Seaford in the same year, and vicar of Cuckfield in 1681.[2] At Lewes he prosecuted the Quakers for non-payment of tithes, and he is mentioned in their archives with a black mark to his name.[3] He was apparently resident vicar of Cuckfield for eight years, and then there is the following entry in one of the parish books: 'W$^{m.}$ Snatt was inducted Vicar here in the latter end of —81, and continued till y^{e} beginning of February or thereabout in the year 1689 when he was deprived by Act of Parliament for not taking the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy to King W$^{m.}$ & Queen Mary.' Snatt, of course, as a Nonjuror lost all his preferments, went to London, and became a friend of at least two of the most eminent of the Nonjurors there, Hilkiah Bedford and Jeremy Collier. But his name does not occur in connection with any Nonjuring ministrations until 1696, when he joined with Collier and Cook in publicly absolving, with the imposition of hands, Sir John Friend and Sir William Parkyns on the scaffold when they were executed for their share in the Assassination Plot.[4] He was tried for a misdemeanour before the King's Bench and was committed to Newgate, but after a short imprisonment was released on bail. He

[1] See *Evelyn's Diary*, for April 10, 1696.

[2] I give these dates from private information kindly supplied to me by the Rev. J. H. Cooper, the present vicar of Cuckfield, to whom I am also indebted for other details about his predecessor.

[3] See *Sussex Archæological Collections*, xvi. 82.

[4] See *supra*, p. 124.

survived for a quarter of a century, and is said to have lived in London, and died there in reduced circumstances on November 30, 1721, 'a true confessor of his distressed and afflicted Church.'

It is difficult to decide where to draw the line in sketching the careers of the more prominent Nonjurors, but there are a few more who require at least a passing notice.

Let us begin with one who attained considerable eminence as an antiquary and historian, but, oddly enough, appears in no list of Nonjurors, and is rarely, if ever, mentioned in connection with them. And yet a Nonjuror he was, and that of a rather unusual type.

Nathanael Salmon (1675–1742), son of Thomas Salmon, rector of Meppershall, Beds., graduated at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, in 1695, and, having received Holy Orders, became curate of Westmill, in Herts. It has been seen that many Nonjurors, who could by no means accept William and Mary as their sovereigns, *did* in a sort of way recognise Queen Anne, at any rate as a kind of stop-gap until her brother was old enough to take the reins. But Salmon reversed the ordinary process; he felt no difficulty about taking the oath to King William (Queen Mary was dead), but he could not accept Queen Anne. So he resigned his charge and practised medicine, first at St. Ives, in Hunts, and then at Bishop Stortford, in Herts. In vain a friend offered him a living of some value in Suffolk; though he was reduced to great poverty he could not conscientiously qualify, so he remained a Nonjuror to the last, employing his leisure in literary work, some of which is of very great value to the student of history. The account of this belongs to a later chapter. Salmon like so many Nonjurors, settled in London, where he died.[1]

[1] See Nichols's *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, ii. 132–3; Cole's *Athenæ Cantabrigienses*; and Gough's *Brit. Topog.* ii. 580.

Abednego Seller (1646 ?–1705) was in his day a man of considerable mark, especially among the Nonjurors. He was a native of Plymouth, and became in 1662 a servitor at Lincoln College, Oxford. For some reason he never took his degree, but was ordained as a literate.[1] In 1682 he became rector of Combe-in-Teignhead, Devon, resigning it in 1686 when he was instituted vicar of St. Charles, Plymouth. At the Revolution he became a Nonjuror and spent the rest of his life in London. He was a well-known writer on Nonjuring, on devotional, and on other subjects. Ambrose Bonwicke tells his father that he 'should have liked Mr. Seller's book much better' than any other in preparing for his Easter Communion in 1711.[2] He was not reduced to poverty like many Nonjurors, for he left to the Bodleian a valuable collection of books. He is frequently referred to by Hearne, who calls him 'Doctissimus' and 'a very learned man,' though not so learned as Thomas Smith, and declares that Dr. W. Cave was much indebted to him for additions to his 'Historia Literaria.'[3] Dodwell, in his letter to Hawes about the closing of the separation on the cession or death of the invalidly deprived Fathers, dwelling upon the intestine divisions of the Nonjurors, says that 'Mr. Seller takes a way by himself,' on which Hickes remarks: 'No way that makes a breach of communion with his brethren, or affects conscience as to the controversy of Schism.'[4] Seller did not live long

[1] There seems to be some mystery in this part of his life. Wood (*Ath. Ox.* iv. 564) says that when he left college he 'past through some mean employment'; Bishop Smalridge, according to Nichols (*Illustr. of Lit.* iii. 253) that 'he had the reputation of a scholar, though not of a good man before he was a Nonjuror.' A Life of him by the Rev. J. Ingle Dredge has been printed for private circulation, but this I have not seen.

[2] See *Life of Ambrose Bonwicke*, p. 30.

[3] Hearne's *Collections*, i. 53–4, ii. 192, 235, 388–9, iii. 15, and *passim*.

[4] MS. in Library of St. John's, Cambridge.

enough to come to the parting of the ways, so it is impossible to say whether he would have followed the example of Dodwell or of Hickes, but to judge from the views expressed in his books he would probably have been on Hickes's side.

We pass on to one who was a friend and near neighbour of the stout old Nonjuring Dean Granville. *John Cock*, a graduate of Christ's College, Cambridge, was rector of Doddington, near Lincoln, from 1662 to 1665,[1] when he was presented to the vicarage of St. Oswald's, Durham; in 1675 he also became lecturer at St. Nicholas, Durham, and held both posts until his ejection as a Nonjuror in 1689. He was 'unwearied in his labours as a parish priest,' and did not forget the spiritual needs of his parishioners after he was perforce removed from them; for he published a volume of twelve sermons, with instructions that five hundred copies were to be distributed among the parishioners of St. Oswald and St. Nicholas, that 'the press might supply the defect of the pulpit from which he has been removed above twenty years, and as his dying legacy to his parishioners, that when dead he may yet preach to them.' The volume was edited, with a brief but very interesting memoir of the writer, by his friend George Hickes in 1710.

William Cole, or Coles, was a fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, and became vicar of Charlbury, in Oxfordshire, a valuable living in the gift of that college, which he held until the Revolution, when he lost it because he refused to take the oaths. Charlbury was a country seat of Henry, second Earl of Clarendon, who has an entry in his diary: 'August 11 [1689], Sunday.—I went to church at Charlebury, where a stranger

[1] For this fact I am indebted to the present rector of Doddington, the Rev. R. E. Cole.

officiated, Mr. Cole not having taken the oaths'; and the biographer of Charles Leslie informs us that 'on two successive Sundays, 8th and 15th of September, 1689, he [Charles Leslie] was the preacher at the services in Charlbury Church, when the rector'—that is, of course, Mr. Cole, for the deprivation did not take place until five months later—'was not only present, but afterwards dined at the same table.'[1] Mr. Cole lived on, without ever coming prominently into public life, until 1735, that is, for forty-five years, but it is recorded many years later: 'His memory is greatly esteemed in the vicinity.'[2]

Robert Orme (d. 1733) is described by Nichols as 'a very antient Nonjuring clergyman who possessed the confidence of those of his own persuasion to a great degree'; and for this cause apparently Nichols singles out Orme's among many letters of sympathy addressed to William Bowyer when his printing office was burnt in 1712;[3] but it is extremely difficult to learn anything very definite about him. He was curate of Lewisham, and was then instituted to the rectory of Wouldham, in Kent, on February 25, 1689–90—that is, just at the time when the controversy between Jurors and Nonjurors was at its acutest stage. He held this living in 1697,[4] when, repenting of his compliance, he threw it up, and was admitted into the Nonjuring communion as 'a Penitent.' There he evidently became a man of some prominence, for he officiated at one of the most important Nonjuring oratories in London, 'in the Parish of S. Botolph without Aldersgate, commonly called Trinity Chapel,' being suc-

[1] *Life and Writings of Charles Leslie*, by Rev. R. J. Leslie, ch. iv. p. 81.

[2] See *Notes and Queries*, 1868, January–June, p. 459.

[3] Nichols's *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, i. 52, note.

[4] I am indebted for these particulars to the Rev. R. W. Taylor, the present rector of Wouldham.

ceeded in it by John Lindsay, one of the most eminent of the later Nonjurors. It is called 'Mr. Orme's Chapel' in the Rawlinson MSS. There is a gossiping story about Orme which seems to rest upon rather slender foundations, but may be inserted for what it is worth. He is said to have visited a fanatical young Jacobite named James Sheppard, who had been convicted of treason in 1718, in Newgate, and to have had more than one unseemly scuffle with the ordinary, Paul Lorraine, for the spiritual possession of the prisoner, to have composed Sheppard's 'last dying speech,' and to have given him absolution on the scaffold, for which offences he was imprisoned in Newgate himself; and the Whig papers said, 'Mr. Orme's friends are very apprehensive that he will shortly have to prepare a speech for himself.'[1] The apprehensions were unnecessary. Mr. Orme survived for fifteen years, and died in his bed, not on the scaffold. He was buried in the churchyard of his old parish, Lewisham. The following notice of his death appeared in *The Daily Post-Boy* for January 15, 1732[3]:

> Yesterday morning died, in a very advanced age, at his house in Jewin Street near Aldersgate, the Rev. Mr. Robert Orme, who had been a Nonjuring Clergyman ever since the Revolution. The integrity of his life, and the simplicity of his manners gained him the esteem and respect of many people of different sentiments.

Another Nonjuring clergyman was more honourably connected with the story of young Sheppard, the Jacobite conspirator.

John Leake (d. 1724) had been lecturer of St. Giles, Cripplegate, and St. Michael, Queenhithe, until the

[1] See Dr. Doran's *London in the Jacobite Times*, i. 305–6, and J. H. Jesse's *Memoirs of the Court of England from the Revolution to the Death of George II.* ii. 304.

Revolution, when he was deprived. Whether he was the 'honest Mr. John Leake, formerly of Hart Hall,' with whom, among others, Hearne walked out from Oxford to Foxcomb on June 10, 1715, to celebrate 'King James III^rd's Birthday,'[1] I cannot say. But he was evidently in London officiating at some small Nonjuring oratory, or perhaps in his own house, in 1718; for Sheppard, a coachmaker's apprentice, who had conceived an enthusiastic attachment to the Stuarts, wrote to him offering 'to go to Italy, if his expenses were paid, bring back our King, and smite the usurper in his palace,' and expressing a desire 'to receive the sacrament daily till he had accomplished his purpose'—that is, in plain words, until he had assassinated George I. Leake very properly gave information to the Government, who seized Sheppard, and, it is said, settled an annuity of two hundred pounds on Leake.[2] His name appears in the 'Catalogue of Nonjurors Writers, from the year 1689,' in the MSS. in St. John's Library; but what he wrote is not mentioned. He died on November 18, 1724.

There were two more Nonjuring clergymen of whom one might have expected to hear much, but of whom, as a matter of fact, one hears little or nothing. One was *Charles Trumbull* (1646–1724), who had formerly been chaplain to Archbishop Sancroft, and administered the last Viaticum to him at Fressingfield, where he was accidentally visiting Sancroft at the time of his death.[3] Trumbull was a man of high family, the younger brother of Sir William Trumbull, a Secretary of State in the time of William III. He was a graduate of Christ

[1] *Reliquiæ Hearnianæ*, ii. 5.

[2] See Dr. Doran's *London in the Jacobite Times*, i. 306, and John Heneage Jesse's *Memoirs of the Court of England from the Revolution in 1688 to the Death of George II.* ii. 304.

[3] See D'Oyly's *Life of Sancroft*, ii. 64.

Church, Oxford (1667), but took the degree of D.C.L. from All Souls' in 1677; so he was probably a fellow there. In 1679 he became rector of Hadleigh, in Suffolk, and of Stisted, in Essex, both being in the gift of the Archbishop of Canterbury. In the 'Calendar of State Papers' we find, in November 1690, a 'Warrant for the presentation of Zach. Fisk to the rectory of Hadley in Suffolk, void by the deprivation of Charles Trumbull, D.D.,' and on 'Jan. 1 Warrant for the presentation of W^m. Shelton to the rectory of Stisted in Essex, void by the deprivation of C. Trumbull, for not having taken the oaths according to the Act of Parliament';[1] and then the name of Charles Trumbull entirely disappears from history until his death is recorded in the 'Historical Register' on January 3, 1724. When he became a Nonjuror he sacrificed two good pieces of preferment, and probably, from his family connections, the prospect of rising much higher. But he was apparently content to suffer quite patiently, without making any agitation, for five-and-thirty years.

The other clergyman is *Nathanael Bisbie* (1635–95), who certainly held a leading position in the diocese of Norwich at the time of the Revolution;[2] and his antecedents justified such a position. He was educated at Westminster and Christ Church, Oxford, where he was a Student, and as far back as 1660 was presented to the rectory of Long Melford, in Suffolk. This he held until the Revolution, 'at which time,' as he himself expressed it, 'the foresaid Nath. Bisbie, being then in the 55^th^ year of his age, and 30^th^ year of his incumbency by vertue of an unrighteous act of a factious and rebellious

[1] *Calendar of State Papers*, 'Domestic Series' (Hardy) William and Mary, May, 1690–October, 1691, p. 218.

[2] See *supra*, p. 40.

convention, was deprived of the rectory of Long Melford for not withgoing his faith and sworn allegiance to King James the Second and transferring it to William, Prince of Orange.'[1] It may be gathered from this passage that Bisbie could write sharply; and so he could, and act sharply too. He is said to have had a quarrel with Sir Robert Cordell, his patron, about tithes and the right of sitting in the chancel; and he wrote several sermons and other treatises, which are severe enough, against dissenters. But all this was *before* his deprivation. During the five or six years that he lived *after* that catastrophe he wrote nothing except, perhaps, one very acute and learned little work, entitled 'Unity of Priesthood necessary to Unity of Communion in a Church' (1692). It was called forth by the appointment of a new primate and new bishops in place of the 'deprived Fathers.' This, it will be remembered, was, in Hickes's opinion, the real beginning of the schism; but the work was published anonymously, and it cannot be said for an absolute certainty that Bisbie was the writer; and apart from this he appears to have been absolutely quiet. He is highly spoken of by both Wood and Hearne. The former says that in his early days 'he was esteemed an excellent preacher and a zealous person for the Church of England.' The latter:

> Nov. 5, 1707: Nath. Bisbie, D^r^ of Div. and Student of X^t^ Church. This Loyal, Religious Divine had a Parsonage of about 300 lbs. per an., which he relinquished after y^e^ Revolution in the time of King William, commonly call'd old Glorious, and could never be brought to side w^th^ y^e^ times or take y^e^ oaths, tho' he had as good motive to it as any man, having a large family. He died very poor.[2]

His death took place May 14, 1695, at Long Melford,

[1] *Athenæ Oxonienses*, iv. 640. [2] *Collections*, ii. 68.

under the shadow of the church where he had ministered for nearly forty years, of which he wrote a long and interesting account, thereby rendering good service to topographers. The fact that 'he died very poor' is borne out by an interesting MS. document in St. John's College Library: 'The Names of the suspended and deprived Clergie Nonswearers in the Diocese of Norwich,' to which is added in Thomas Baker's own handwriting 'This was drawn up in order to their Relief.' An evidently honest investigation had been made as to their circumstances, for some are described as 'not poor,' 'not very poor,' 'well to passe,' 'a single man,' but 'Doct. Bishby [*sic*], Rector of Melford, has a wife and children, and is poor.'

One more clergyman must be noticed, not for any distinction which he achieved, but for the extraordinary length of his incumbency. *John Watson* was rector of Saltfleetby St. Clement's, in Lincolnshire, for more than seventy years! It seems incredible, but Bishop Jackson, of Lincoln, a cautious man, said he believed the tradition was true, and could be proved by documentary evidence. He is said to have been ejected from his benefice in the time of the Commonwealth, when one of Cromwell's drummers was put in his place. At the Restoration he was reinstated, and was again ejected at the Revolution as a Nonjuror, when he must have been considerably over ninety years of age. He lived on until 1693 in the parish of which he had so long been rector.[1]

It may be objected that, after all, very little appears to be known about these last eight Nonjuring clergymen. Exactly so; that is just the point. Enough is known about most of them to show that, though they had

[1] I am indebted for this information to my old friend the Rev. W. Watson, rector of the neighbouring parish of Saltfleetby St. Peter's.

abilities, or social position, or other qualities enough to enable them to make a noise in the world, they preferred to submit quietly to their fate without murmuring; their very silence is eloquent. The list might be swelled, but as other clergy will come before us in connection with the later Nonjurors, enough space has perhaps been given to the clerical element in the party.

CHAPTER V

THE NONJURING LAITY

It is obvious that the laity were in a somewhat different position from the clergy in respect to the oaths. If they held no post which necessitated swearing allegiance to the Government, their hands were not forced; they could play the game as they chose. Unless they were active Jacobites they were not bound even by a moral obligation to involve themselves in any trouble about the subject; they were at liberty to hold what opinions they pleased without being molested. And I believe that, as a matter of fact, a great number of laymen were in full sympathy with the Nonjurors without becoming Nonjurors themselves. It was sufficient if they showed personal kindness, as many of them did most nobly, to those clerical sufferers for conscience' sake who sorely needed such kindness.

Again, not being preachers, they had not committed themselves publicly, as so many of the clergy had done, to opinions about passive obedience, non-resistance, and Divine right, the only logical conclusion of which was the rejection of the Revolution Settlement and the Hanoverian Succession.

Under these circumstances the wonder is, not that there was only 'a small sprinkling of laity' (as the phrase went) who openly sided with the Nonjuring clergy, but that there were so many who did;[1] that this chapter, in fact,

[1] A writer in *The Cheshire Sheaf* (No. 61, p. 57) says boldly that 'about our hundred clergy and a *much larger number of laymen* refused on con-

is not all but a blank, instead of being a most important and fruitful branch of the subject.

London, Oxford, and Cambridge were the places with which the majority of the Nonjurors noticed in the last chapter were chiefly connected. The scene must now be shifted to the small country village of Shottesbrooke, in Berkshire, for with this village the names of three of the most notable of the Nonjuring laity—Henry Dodwell, Francis Cherry, and Thomas Hearne—are associated; and Shottesbrooke was also a pleasant retreat, and sometimes a safe refuge for other Nonjurors, both lay and clerical.[1]

Among the early Nonjuring laity the first place must undoubtedly be assigned to Henry Dodwell, not because he was the highest in rank, for there were many above him, nor because he was the best-known writer of the class, for there were many better known; least of all because he had the wisest judgment, for he often embarrassed his friends quite as much as his foes by his various eccentricities. But as a scholar and a divine there was no layman who could be for a moment compared with him; and as a leader he took so prominent a position that he was called 'the great lay dictator' of the whole party.[2] It was probably Dodwell as much as any man who directed the policy of the first Nonjurors; it was certainly Dodwell *more* than any man who caused the first return of a set of Nonjurors to the National Church, which was virtually the beginning of the end of the Nonjuring separation.

scientious grounds to take the oaths of allegiance to William and Mary.' I do not know on what evidence his assertion rests, but I am not prepared to dispute its correctness.

[1] Perhaps I may be allowed to refer to an article I wrote in *Longman Magazine* for March 1886, on 'A Country Village in the beginning of the Eighteenth Century' (Shottesbrooke).

[2] See, *inter alia*, *Life of Bishop Frampton*, p. 203.

Henry Dodwell (1641–1711) was born at Dublin, but both his parents were of English extraction, and returned to England when their son was only seven years old. In England he received his early education, first at the Free School at York, and then under his uncle, Henry Dodwell, incumbent of Hemley and Newbourne in Suffolk; so we cannot, as otherwise we might be tempted to do, set down his eccentricities to his Irish blood or training. He returned, however, to Ireland to complete his education; in 1656 he was admitted at Trinity College, Dublin, and was elected in due course, first scholar and then fellow; but he soon resigned his fellowship through that sensitiveness of conscience which was a marked feature in his character. And here it may be noted that when Dodwell's eccentricities are spoken of, it always means eccentricities of speculation, not of conduct; his conduct was only so far eccentric as it was abnormally unselfish, pure, and high-minded. He lost his fellowship, *e.g.*, because he had conscientious objections to take Holy Orders, the College Statutes requiring that every fellow who was an M.A. of three years' standing should be ordained; but the 'conscientious objections' were the very reverse of those which now unhappily prevent too many men of high attainments and abilities from entering the sacred ministry. It was not because he had doubts, but because he had so intense a belief in all the doctrines of Christianity that he shrank from ordination. He did not think himself good enough for it; and, moreover, as the great object of his life was to recommend the religion in which he believed heart and soul, he thought he could do this more effectually if he remained a layman, for then he could not be suspected of interested motives, or of holding a brief for the Faith. Bishop Jeremy Taylor offered to use his influence to obtain a dispensa-

tion for him to hold his fellowship as a layman; but he declined the offer as a bad precedent for the college. We then lose sight of him for awhile, but find him in 1674 in London, 'as being a place where was a variety of learned persons, and which afforded him opportunity of meeting with books both of ancient and modern authors.'[1] There he made acquaintance with men of literary mark, such as Bishop Pearson, of Chester, and Bishop Lloyd, of St. Asaph, and in 1688 he was elected without solicitation Camdenian Prælector (often, but incorrectly, called Professor) of Ancient History at Oxford. At the Revolution he at once resigned the post because he could not take the new oaths. It was in vain represented to him by learned counsel that 'the Act seemed not to reach his case, in that he was Prælector, not Professor.' He must have been strongly tempted to take advantage of the chance, for he was eminently qualified for the post he held, and had already delivered some valuable and highly appreciated 'prælections'; and he had certainly no reason to be grateful to James II., for through that King's bigoted policy he had lost all his little property in Ireland, and had actually been included in the Act of Attainder as a Protestant. At Oxford, above all places, he was thoroughly in his element, and he remained there without office for some little time, and then retired to the beautiful little village of Cookham, on the Thames. He used to walk daily into the neighbouring town of Maidenhead to hear the news and learn what books were newly published, and there he used to meet Francis Cherry, who came in for the same purpose from Shottesbrooke, a village on the other side of Maidenhead. The two men naturally struck up a friendship, agreeing, as they did, both in their theological and political views; and Cherry

[1] Article on 'Dodwell, Henry,' in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

persuaded Dodwell to remove from Cookham to Shottesbrooke, where he fitted up a house for him near his own. They maintained jointly a Nonjuring chaplain to minister to their families; first a Mr. Gilbert, of St. John's College, Oxford, who had been vicar of Medmenham, in the immediate neighbourhood, before the Revolution;[1] and, on his death, Mr. Francis Brokesby, already noticed.[2] They had also a sort of joint *protégé* in Thomas Hearne; their kindness to whom will appear presently. Shottesbrooke became a little centre of Nonjurors who recognised Dodwell as their head, though they were now and then dismayed by his startling theories. But his immense learning, his single-hearted piety, and his fascinating personality quite outweighed his eccentricities, and the dictatorial tendency which he certainly showed at times in public does not appear to have displayed itself to his friends in private. On the contrary, both Hearne and Brokesby, who knew him very intimately, dwell upon his humility, Hearne describing him as 'humble and modest to a fault'; while Cherry indignantly defended him from the charge when Dr. Mill called him 'the proudest man living.'[3] Dodwell had a busy pen, and he employed it most sedulously, both in public and in private, on the great questions which were agitating the Church and nation at the Revolution. In the interval between the suspension and the deprivation of the Nonjuring bishops he published 'A Cautionary Discourse of Schism, with a particular Regard to the Case of the Bishops who are Suspended for refusing to take the New Oath,' and to this public caution he added private remonstrances. His book was written with a design to prevent, if possible, the

[1] See Hearne's *Collections*, i. 211.
[2] See *supra*, p. 206–7.
[3] See Hearne's *Collections*, i. 272.

filling up of the sees of the deprived bishops;[1] and with the same design he wrote to Tillotson when he was on the eve of accepting the primacy a severe letter of remonstrance, urging him not to be 'the aggressor in the new designed schism, in erecting another altar against the hitherto acknowledged altar of your deprived fathers and brethren,'[2] and concluding very characteristically: 'No more, but that I am, till you have formed your schism, Your affectionate, but suffering,' &c. He also wrote, in very spirited and rather dictatorial language, to Dr. Sherlock on his tergiversation, saying, among other things: 'Your practical Discourse of Death made us expect you would have been faithful to the Death, though even the fear of death had been urg'd to drive you from your constancy.'[3]

He, moreover, felt it his mission to keep the deprived Fathers themselves up to the mark, and therefore wrote two rather strong exhortations to Bishop Ken and Bishop Frampton when he thought they were wavering. Against the tone of these exhortations the two good prelates rebelled a little, and their biographers still more.[4] He rushed with characteristic courage into the fray against one of the most powerful and effective of all the defenders of the Revolution, Humphrey Hody, who had been a resident at Oxford with him, and a personal friend; but personal friendship weighed as nothing against public duty with Henry Dodwell. Hody had found among the Baroccian MSS. in the Bodleian a Greek treatise, ascribed to Nicephorus, which he translated and published under the title of 'The Unreasonableness of a Separation from

[1] *Life of Kettlewell* (*Compleat Works*), i. 126.

[2] See Birch's *Life of Tillotson*, p. 246.

[3] 'Two Letters from Mr. Dodw—l: (1) to Dr. Sherl—ck, (2) to Dr. illot—n,' among the Rawlinson MSS. in the Bodleian Library.

[4] See *Life of Frampton*, edited by T. Simpson Evans, p. 203, an mptre's *Life of Ken*, ii. 41.

the New Bishops: or, a Treatise out of Ecclesiastical History, showing that, although a Bishop was unjustly deprived, neither he nor the Church ever made a Separation, if the successor was not a heretick' (1691). The work was ably answered in the 'Unity of the Christian Priesthood,' probably by Dr. Bisbie, as already noticed;[1] but it was clearly a case also to call forth the Coryphæus of the party. Hody was a foeman worthy of his steel; Dodwell was on his own ground, on which he was quite unrivalled by any Nonjuror; and if the Nonjurors really had ecclesiastical history against them they might throw up the sponge at once, for that was their strong point. So, in answer to Hody, Dodwell produced his exceedingly valuable 'Vindication of the Deprived Bishops, &c.' (1692), the book which, in my opinion, was the strongest of all the works written in defence of the position of the early Nonjurors. Of course it was no use fighting against the master of thirty legions, so it had no effect; but there it remains, a worthy monument of the keenest and most learned among a singularly keen and learned little body of men.

It was not much noticed at the time that Dodwell's 'Vindication, &c.' and his subsequent 'Defence' of it brought him slightly into collision, on the other side, with Kettlewell. Dodwell admitted that 'if there had been a Synodical Deprivation of the Orthodox and Faithful Fathers of the Church, however in itself unjust, yet the Clergy and Laity ought to have complied with the greater obligation of owning the Episcopal College than with the less obligation of owning any particular bishop.' Kettlewell dissented from this view on the ground that 'Truth and Righteousness and Holy Unspotted Worship in the Church' were more important than even Church

[1] See *supra*, p. 226.

unity. The Church was made for religion, not religion for the Church.[1] Kettlewell was called to his rest long before the division; but his attitude on this occasion, combined with other passages in his works, makes it to my mind extremely doubtful whether, if he had been spared to see it, he would have joined the Dodwell, and not the Hickes party. This almost unnoticed disagreement was in reality the first little rift in the lute which afterwards widened into an open breach. Dodwell was the first to call attention to the possibility of such a breach by publishing, in 1705, his 'Case in View.' He thought, most wisely, that it would be better to be prepared for a case which must inevitably occur, and not be obliged to decide it hastily when the time for action came. They were now all agreed that their allegiance was due to their deprived Fathers; but when those fathers were all removed by death, or if any survivors agreed to waive their claim—what then? The 'Case in View' became the 'Case in Fact' five years later, and Dodwell published his last work under that title, urging that *now* was the time to close the schism. The practical result was that in 1710 the Shottesbrooke group, Robert Nelson, 'and others,' returned to the National Church. The loss of Dodwell and his friends was by far the greatest blow which the Nonjuring cause had yet received. In the first place, names must be *weighed* as well as *counted*, and those of the seceders were very weighty names indeed. Then, again, it was quite different from the secession of such men as Dr. Sherlock and Mr. Higden, who, able as they were, were sorely put to it to justify their apparent inconsistency, and were forced, in fact, to cry *peccavimus*. But Dodwell and his friends had no need to utter any such humiliating cry. It may have

[1] See Lee's *Life of Kettlewell*, i. 126–7.

been—I think it was—an open question whether everything that they, and Dodwell especially, had written before was logically consistent with their re-absorption in the National Church. But their position was a perfectly intelligible one. They owed allegiance to certain men; when those men died, or waived their claims to allegiance, why should they any longer hold aloof from common worship with their brethren? The general verdict of posterity has been that Dodwell and his friends were right—Hickes and *his* friends wrong; in other words, the general sympathy of Churchmen has been *with* the Nonjurors up to the crisis of 1710—*against* them after that crisis; and as Dodwell was undoubtedly the leader of what may be called the winning party, that circumstance alone makes his position in one sense unique. 1710 was the beginning of the end, that end being the extinction of the Nonjurors. When the bells of Shottesbrooke rang a joyous peal to welcome back Dodwell and his friends to their beautiful parish church, they at the same time virtually sounded a funeral knell in anticipation of the death of the party with which those good men had acted for more than twenty years.

The matter, however, does not seem so clear to me as it does to the majority of Churchmen. Was the major premiss of the argument quite as Dodwell put it? 'We owe allegiance to certain men.' Yes! but surely it was, and always had been, far more than a mere question as to whether certain individuals had or had not a claim upon their allegiance. It was not a personal matter at all, but a matter of general principle. If it had been argued, 'The Church has nothing to do with politics, and her unity ought not to be broken for the sake of this or that secular ruler,' it would have been intelligible. But this was not so. When they ceased to be Nonjurors they did

not cease to be Jacobites, and therefore they could not throw themselves thoroughly into the services of the Church to which they returned. There were still what were called 'the State Prayer Days'—that is, National Fast and Thanksgiving Days—which they could not observe because they were appointed by an authority which they did not recognise; and such days were far more numerous then than they are now. There were still the 'immoral prayers' at all the regular services, in which they could not conscientiously join; and the various devices which they adopted to show they were not joining in them—such as standing and facing the congregation, sliding off their knees and sitting on a hassock, turning over the leaves of their Prayer Books, so as to avoid hearing the obnoxious words, and even pretending to take snuff—were rather embarrassing proceedings, and not very edifying to the general congregation.

Dodwell died at Shottesbrooke on June 7, 1711. It may seem strange that both the life and writings of the man who may be called the captain of the winning side should have fallen into oblivion. Dodwell was quite as pious and far more learned a man than either Ken or Sancroft, Nelson or Kettlewell; and yet for ten persons who know something about these good men there is probably not one who knows anything about 'the great Mr. Dodwell.' But when one looks more closely into the matter it is not surprising. Dodwell's writings are defective both in style and method, and the strange theories he sometimes propounds and the strange arguments he sometimes uses are enough to shipwreck any writer; and he had not the fortune to find a biographer who could make his memory live. Mr. Brokesby did no service to his friend and patron by writing a very slight and inadequate biography of him. Hearne tells us

(August 17, 1705) that he had seen in Mr. Cherry's study in an *octavo* book a great many particulars relating to Mr. Dodwell's life, 'which,' he says, 'he will take care to publish if he survives him.'[1] He *did* survive him for a short time, but not long enough to carry out his purpose, if he had formed it; and he can hardly have communicated these particulars to Mr. Brokesby, for his 'Life of Dodwell' is singularly jejune in details, and Hearne was really justified in writing somewhat contemptuously of it.[2] It would have been better if Hearne had himself undertaken the life; we gain a more vivid idea of what Dodwell was from Hearne's brief obituary notices of him than from Brokesby's whole volume.[3]

It would have been better still if Hearne had given us the biographies of *both* his patrons, anticipating a modern title and calling his work 'The Lives of Two Good Men,' for he is as enthusiastic in his admiration of Francis Cherry as of Henry Dodwell; and the two would have made excellent companion pictures, which no one could have drawn better than their *protégé*.

Francis Cherry (1665[4]–1713) was a fine specimen of a class which thrives nowhere so well as in England. He was a thorough country gentleman, addicted to manly sports and graced with polite accomplishments, 'a bold rider,' and 'an elegant dancer,' and so popular among his country neighbours that he was called 'the idol of Berkshire.' But he had higher gifts than these; he was a man of intellectual tastes and varied culture, a collector of manuscripts, coins, and other antiquities, a man who was quite competent to assist Dodwell and Hearne in

[1] *Collections*, i. 30. [2] See *Reliquiæ Hearnianæ*, i. 314.

[3] See Hearne's *Collections*, iii. 176–7.

[4] I adopt Hearne's date. Cherry's granddaughter, Mrs. Eliza Berkeley, gives the date two years later. See her Preface to the Poems of her son, George Monck Berkeley.

their learned researches; and, best of all, a man of genuine piety, modesty, and sweetness of temper. He was educated as a gentleman-commoner at St. Edmund Hall, Oxford, and having taken his degrees, married very suitably and settled down for life at Shottesbrooke. He threw in his lot, heart and soul, with the Nonjurors, and was so far a Jacobite that all his sympathies were with the exiled Stuarts; but he was far too honourable and high-minded a man to join in any secret plots and conspiracies. There is, indeed, an idle story told of him, that, hunting with the King's stag-hounds, which used to meet in his neighbourhood, he gave a lead at a dangerous leap to William III., also a bold rider, hoping that 'the usurper' would follow him and break his neck; but if he ever expressed the wish it could only have been in joke, for such a truculent design was quite foreign to his character. He made, however, no secret of his sentiments; his noble residence in Shottesbrooke Park was a general rendezvous, and often a harbour of refuge for distressed Nonjurors; he could make up seventy beds, and there he frequently entertained men like Robert Nelson and Thomas Ken; and Charles Leslie, when outlawed, lay for some months *perdu*, disguised in regimentals, in a house belonging to Mr. Cherry at White Waltham, hard by. He was not one of those Jacobites who tacitly acquiesced in the claims of Queen Anne, on the ground that she was a sort of regent for her brother. On the contrary, he showed his marked disapproval of her conduct in accepting the crown. When she was still only the Princess Anne, she gave tokens of her favour to the handsome young squire whom she was accustomed to meet out hunting; but when she became queen, Cherry carefully avoided her; and she, so far from being offended, sent him presents of wine, and said, 'I esteem

Mr. Cherry one of the honestest gentlemen in my dominions.'

There is a particular interest about the life of Francis Cherry, because it presents to us, so to say, the other side of the shield. The country gentleman of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is often represented as an ignorant, bigoted, sensual animal, only one link removed from a brute; and such a slave to field sports that, as was wittily said, Goliath's curse seemed to have passed upon him, 'I will give thee unto the Fowls of the Air and to the Beasts of the Field.'[1] Macaulay's description of the country gentleman of the period is too well known to be quoted. It is derived, he tells us, partly from the light literature of the day;[2] but the description of Mr. Cherry is drawn from well-ascertained facts; and it shows us that if there were Squire Westerns, there were also Squire Allworthys in real life. We must, of course, make some little allowance for the partiality of Hearne towards the man who had been the making of him; but, so far as I know, there is really nothing to be set *per contra* to the glowing panegyrics which he passes upon Francis Cherry.[3]

The next member of the Shottesbrooke group is Hearne himself.

Thomas Hearne (1678–1735) belongs, strictly speaking, to the later Nonjurors; but he was so very closely connected with Dodwell and Cherry, 'his two best friends,' that it would be almost cruel to separate him from them. He has given so vivid an idea of himself, both in his 'Collections' and his 'Autobiography,' that it would be

[1] Quoted by Addison (?) in the *Spectator*, vol. viii. No. 583. *Feras consumere nati* is Fielding's happy description of the class.

[2] See *History of England*, i. 156–8.

[3] See *Reliquiæ Hearnianæ*, i. 287–8. *Collections* (Oxf. Hist. Soc.), i. 272, iii. 336, and *passim*.

sheer Philistinism not to describe him largely in his own words.

Hearne was born at White Waltham, where his father was parish clerk and 'kept a writing-school.'[1] Circumstances, of course, did not allow him to afford his son a liberal education, who had therefore

> to go to day-labour for a subsistence. But the boy being much talked of for the skill he had obtained in reading and writing beyond his years, it occasioned that pious and learned gentleman, Francis Cherry Esq^r, to put him to the Free-School at Bray on purpose to learn the Latin tongue, which his father was not entirely master of.

So in the early part of 1693 he went to Bray School as a day-boy, 'living at his father's house three miles off.' This went on for about two years, and then, as Hearne tells us with delightful naïveté,

> Mr. Cherry being fully satisfied of the great and surprizing progress he had made, by the advice of that good and learned man, Mr. Dodwell (who then lived at Shottesbrooke) he resolved to take him into his own House, which accordingly he did about Easter, 1695, and provided for him as if he had been his own son. He instructed him, not only in the true principles of the Church of England, but in Classical Learning, and 'twas for this end that when he was at home he constantly heard him read, and when absent he took care that he should read to Mr. Dodwell.

Then follows a grateful account of the pains these two good men took with him, and then 'Mr. Cherry thought now of nothing less than giving him an academical education.' So he had him 'entered a Battelar at S. Edmund Hall,' and in 'Easter Term, 1696, came himself with him to Oxford, provided a Chamber, and all things necessary for him, and saw him fully settled down

[1] In this sketch of Hearne, any words put between inverted commas are quotations from the Autobiography, unless otherwise described in the notes.

before he returned.' Soon after he had taken his degree of B.A. in 1699 'a proposal was made to him by a Person that was then looked upon as pretty honest, tho' he has proved otherwise since, of going to Maryland.' This is Hearne's rather ungracious way of describing a kind letter, still extant, which Dr. Kennett, who was rector of Shottesbrooke, and also Vice-Principal of St. Edmund Hall, wrote to him offering him parochial work under Dr. Bray. However, in the interests of learning, it is certainly well that he did not accept it. Oxford was the proper place for him, and at Oxford he remained. He 'went to the Bodleian every day, and Hudson when elected Library Keeper took him, by consent of the Curators, as assistant-keeper. The Library being in very great confusion, and requiring the care of a very diligent and knowing Person to put it in order'—such a person, in short, as himself. In 1703 he became M.A., and 'some time after a Chaplainship of Corpus Christi College was offered him by Dr. Thomas Turner, the President, on condition that he kept his place at the Library. But he was forced to decline the offer, Dr. Hudson being resolved that he should hold nothing else with the Library.' In 1712 he 'became Second Keeper of the Bodleian,' and on 'Jan. 19, 1714–5, was very honourably elected Architypographus and Superior or Esquire Bedell.' But 'Dr. Hudson pretended that the offices of Under-Librarian and Beadle were inconsistent,' so he actually locked the Library against him. But Hearne 'continued to execute the office of Librarian when he could get into the Library until Jan. 23 [1715–6], when he desisted upon account of the oaths, that being the last day fixed by the new Act.' Some thought that the Act would not touch him, but by the advice of 'his best friends' he retired quietly, and lived for the remaining twenty years of his

life in his rooms in Edmund Hall, prosecuting his studies to the great benefit of posterity. He had many posts offered him, which he specifies, both in and out of Oxford, but he declined them all, 'preferring a good conscience before all manner of preferment and worldly honour.' He died in his rooms on June 10, 1735, and was buried in the neighbouring churchyard of St. Peter's in the East.

Hearne derived his Nonjuring principles from Dodwell and Cherry, and when he heard that they had returned to the National Church he writes in approval of their action; but he had not then heard that 'the Nonjuring bishops continued their succession' (as he puts it).[1] There is no doubt that eventually, in spite of his immense respect for Dodwell, he identified himself with the Hickes, not the Dodwell section.[2]

It must be remembered, however, that Dodwell and Cherry did not live long enough to see the accession of the House of Hanover, and that towards the close of their lives there was a very strong hope that Queen Anne might be succeeded by her brother. But Hearne lived to see all these hopes frustrated, and his expressions with regard to those who complied under the new dynasty are even stronger, if possible, than those which he used against the compliers of the earlier period. He was, in short, a thoroughpaced Jacobite and Nonjuror, and, with rare exceptions, has a good word for those only who agreed with his political views. He was also one of those pen-portrait painters who have no such colour as grey; his black men are very black and his white men very white. He thought also that he had been treated shabbily, and hence there is a vein of disappointment and soreness running through his 'Collections.' So, while they

[1] *Reliquiæ Hearnianæ*, i. 187. [2] *Ibid.* iii. 116.

give one of the fullest and most vivid accounts we possess of the time in which he lived, his estimates of his contemporaries must be taken with a large grain of salt. They were not published, and probably not intended by him for publication, though no greater service has been rendered to letters than by the publication of the 'Reliquiæ Hearnianæ,' containing judicious selections from the 145 'volumes' by Dr. Philip Bliss in 1857, and a fuller edition in 1869, and the far fuller publication still which is now being made under able editorship by the Oxford Historical Society. By a cruel irony of fate, the only writing of Thomas Hearne on the Nonjuring question published during his lifetime was one written on the other side.

> Among some MSS. of his patron, Mr. Cherry, was said to be found a MS. of Mr. H. which he endeavoured in vain to recover, and this disappointment very much vexed him. . . . It was an undeserved piece of Chastisement as Mr. H. had openly declared himself ashamed of a tract written in his younger days, and never intended for the Press. It was 'A Vindication of those who take the Oath of Allegiance to his present Majesty' [King William III.] and was printed in 1731.

The anonymous author of the Preface writes as if he were a friend of Hearne; but it certainly seems as if the publication were a grim and rather cruel joke. Probably no one would have been more dismayed and annoyed by the publication than Mr. Cherry himself, the unconscious and innocent cause of it. But Hearne need not have feared that posterity would doubt that he was 'an honest man,' both in his own technical sense of the term and in a wider and better sense.

There is another honoured name which for more reasons than one we naturally associate with the Shottesbrooke group. Robert Nelson was an intimate friend of them all, a frequent visitor at Shottesbrooke Park, and

one who took the same road that Dodwell and Cherry took when they came to the parting of the ways at the death of Bishop Lloyd. He was a link between the Non-jurors and the Jurors; for he numbered among his friends such men as Sancroft, Ken, Frampton, Kettlewell, Cherry, Dodwell, Hickes, and Lee on the one side, and Tillotson, Bull, Beveridge, Sharp, Smalridge, S. Wesley, Bray, Thoresby, and Mapletoft on the other.[1] It was not that he was one of those vapid personages who, having no particular opinions of their own, are ready to adapt themselves to the opinions of those with whom they are brought into contact. Quite the reverse. His principles were perfectly definite; but he had the happy knack of being, in the proper Pauline sense of the expression, 'all things to all men.' 'You,' wrote Hickes to him, 'can discourse with all sorts of men, with whom you differ in matters of religion in the same easy and obliging manner as with those with whom you agree.'[2]

Robert Nelson (1656–1715) was a Londoner by birth, the son of a 'Turkey merchant,' who died when Robert was only a year old, leaving him a good fortune. He was educated for a short time at St. Paul's School; but on the removal of his mother to Driffield, or Dryfield, near Cirencester, his education was continued under a private tutor, George Bull, then vicar of the two Suddingtons, also near Cirencester. He probably owes his strong Church principles to the early impression made on him by Bull, and he amply repaid the obligation by writing an appreciative life of his old tutor, one of the few biographies that will live. He entered as a fellow-commoner at Trinity College, Cambridge, but for some

[1] This point is well brought out by Mr. Abbey in *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century*, ch. iii., 'Robert Nelson, his Friends, and Church Principles.'

[2] Secretan's *Life of Nelson*, i. 37.

reason never resided.[1] In 1679 we find him in London, and about this time sprang up his intimacy with Tillotson, the closest friend of his early manhood. He made the Grand Tour—a necessary completion in those days of the education of a gentleman—and became acquainted at Rome with Lady Theophila, widow of Sir Kingsmill Lucy, and daughter of the Earl of Berkeley, whom he married in 1682. It is not quite clear whether it was before or after her marriage with Nelson that Lady Theophila joined the Roman Communion. At any rate Nelson did not know it when he contracted the union, and the discovery was a great grief to him. But the difference of religion made no difference in his affection for his wife, and their union was perfectly happy until her death in 1706. So far, however, from being himself in the least inclined towards Rome, he wrote after his marriage his first work under the title of 'Transubstantiation contrary to Scripture; or the Protestant's Answer to the Seeker's Request' (1687).

When the Revolution took place, Nelson seems never to have had the slightest doubt as to what his duty was in regard to the *King*, but very considerable doubt as to what it was in regard to the *Church*. Of course he had no need to become a professed Nonjuror in the literal sense, because he held no office which necessitated taking the new oaths. But, like his friend Cherry, he was a thorough Jacobite. He disapproved altogether of the expedition of the Prince of Orange; and when it was imminent he withdrew from England, where he was paying a visit, and spent some time in Italy, where he had much correspondence with Lord Melfort, King James's ambas-

[1] Among the 'Matriculations, Graduations, &c., of Nonjurors in the University of Cambridge,' in the MS. book in St. John's Library, is '*Nelson* (Rob.), Coll. Trin. Socio-Commensalis An. 1678.'

sador at Rome.[1] He returned to England in 1691 with a firm determination never to acknowledge William and Mary as his sovereigns; but he was not so certain whether he was for that reason bound to leave the Communion of the Established Church. The only difficulty which weighed with him was that of attending services where prayers were offered for sovereigns whom he could not recognise; and, oddly enough, the man who led him to withdraw from 'the national Communion' was Tillotson. It was natural for him in his perplexity to consult his friend; and Tillotson's reply was perhaps unexpectedly decisive: 'I think it plain that no man can join in prayers in which there is any petition which he is verily persuaded is sinful. I cannot endure a trick anywhere, much less in religion.'[2] So Nelson became a Nonjuror, and this threw him into the society of men from whom he learned to dislike more and more the latitudinarian and Erastian views which were making headway in the National Church, and also to take higher sacramental views. Kettlewell, as long as he lived, and afterwards Hickes, took the place which Tillotson held before, and their influence over Nelson is very perceptible. But all the while it seems to me that he was yearning for the breach to be healed; and he gladly embraced every opportunity of joining when he possibly could in any good work with those from whom he was temporarily divided. His was essentially a practical mind; and he probably felt that he could do more practical good in conjunction with a large community than with a small one. No one knew him during his Nonjuring stage better than Dr. Hickes, and when he returned to the Established Communion, Hearne tells us that 'Mr. Nelson was not much wondered at by Dr. Hickes and his friends for acting thus, for he had all along spoke generally more

[1] See Secretan, p. 33.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 46–7.

honourably of the complyers than of the sufferers, and had written the Life of bp. Bull, who always did comply, though he were undoubtedly a very great man.'[1] But Nelson never ceased to be a Jacobite. The book which, perhaps, of all others made the greatest flutter in the Revolution dove-cot, 'The Hereditary Right Asserted,' was not only approved by Nelson, but actually revised by him before its publication,[2] and this, it must be remembered, was in 1713, when he was in full communion with the Established Church. His withdrawal from the Nonjurors was about as severe a blow as they could have received; for Nelson's high character and sound judgment were so much respected by many Churchmen that they thought whatever he did must be right. It was a particularly severe blow to his friend Hickes, though he may not have been surprised at it. When he heard that it was impending he begged Nelson to wait until he should have had time to write out for him in full the reasons for continuing the separation. Nelson consented to wait until the following Easter, but no longer. Hickes was prevented by sickness from carrying out his work in time, and Nelson received the Holy Communion at St. Mildred's, Poultry, on Easter Day, 1710, at the hands of Archbishop Sharp, who had much to do with his return to the Established Church. It is to the credit of both parties that the step does not seem to have interfered with the friendship of Nelson and Hickes. They had been very intimate, and at one time when they lived close together in Great Ormond Street, saw each other every day. Nelson often speaks of 'my neighbour the Dean,' an expression which seems to indicate that on the one hand he did not recognise Hickes's lay-deprivation of the deanery, and on the other that he was not aware of his

[1] *Reliquiæ Hearnianæ*, iii. 117. [2] See Secretan, pp. 50, 85–8.

consecration to the episcopate. It is said that at one time they lived together in Lamb's Conduit Street; but it is rather difficult, and not very important, to trace out Nelson's various dwelling-places; they were all in or about London, as was necessary for a man who was in the thick of all philanthropic and Church work. Having lived for some years at Blackheath, he seems to have removed in 1703 to Ormond Street, and after the death of Lady Theophila to a smaller house. His last residence was in a house of his own in Gloucester Street, to which his remains were removed, for he died at Kensington in the house of his cousin, Mrs. Delicia Wolff, on January 16, 1714–5. A curious circumstance is connected with his burial, which illustrates at once the good sense of the man and the extraordinary estimation in which he was held. The nearest burying ground to his residence was a new cemetery in Lamb's Conduit Fields, in the parish of St. George the Martyr; but there was for some reason a prejudice against the use of it until Nelson, according to his own directions, was buried there; then the prejudice was dispelled, as if it were quite safe to follow where so good a man led the way.[1]

To recount all the efforts for pious and benevolent purposes in which Nelson took a more or less leading part is really to enumerate almost all the organisations of the English Church in one of the most active periods of her history. The Religious Societies (in the technical, not the general, meaning of the term), the Societies for the Reformation of Manners, the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, the Associates of Dr. Bray, the Charity Schools, the Corporation of the Sons of the Clergy, the Commission for Building Fifty New Churches

[1] See, *e.g.*, *Reliquiæ Hearnianæ*, iii. 176.

in and about London, all found in Robert Nelson a most active and intelligent supporter, who spared neither personal pains nor money in their behalf. Moreover, he anticipated the work of a later day by suggesting many others, such as theological colleges, hospitals for incurables, Schools for Blackguard Boys (corresponding to what *we* call, more euphemistically, Ragged Schools).[1] In short, wherever there was any good to be done, *there* was the 'pious Robert Nelson'[2] ready to do it.

With the name of Robert Nelson one naturally associates that of another Nonjuring layman, Francis Lee, who took an active part in Nelson's benevolent schemes, helped him in some of his publications, and worked up the materials which Nelson and Hickes had collected for the Life of Kettlewell. Lee subscribes one of his letters to Nelson: 'To the best of friends from the most affectionate of friends.' So, having noticed one of the friends let us now turn to the other.

Francis Lee (1661–1719) was one of the Lichfield family, who went from Merchant Taylors' to St. John's, Oxford, as a scholar in 1679, and was elected fellow in 1682. Like many Nonjurors, when he was deprived of his fellowship he studied medicine, and, having first been a student at the University of Leyden, took the M.D. degree at Padua, and practised as a physician for a year or two in Venice. As he passed through Holland on his way home in 1694 he became acquainted with the writings of Mrs. Jane Lead, whom he sought out in London, and became not only her convert, but her son-in-law, marrying, at her suggestion, her widowed daughter, Barbara Walton, in whose house in Hogsden Square he resided.

[1] See Secretan, pp. 91, 147 *et seq.*

[2] That was his general title, and Mr. Secretan rightly entitles his work, *Memoirs of the Life and Times of the pious Robert Nelson.*

In conjunction with his old friend at school and college, Richard Roach, he became a chief supporter—indeed, one of the founders—of the short-lived Philadelphian Society, he and Roach publishing the 'Theosophical Transactions' of that Society at intervals in 1697. Meanwhile his old friends were by no means pleased with his new proceedings; his brother, William Lee, strongly objected to his marriage; his brother Nonjuror, Henry Dodwell, to his 'enthusiasm' and separation from the Church. A very long and interesting correspondence between him and Dodwell ensued, commencing in 1697 and ending in 1702. Dodwell began it with the words:

> Worthy Sir,—I was at once both troubled and surprised to hear, that so good and so accomplished a person as you are, should be engaged in a new division from that church, for whose principles you had so generously suffered;

and ended his letter:

> Return to your deserted brethren, and contribute not to the further divisions and ruin of that small number, to which we are reduced that I may again be able to justify by principles, the subscribing myself, Your most affectionate brother,
>
> Henry Dodwell.

One can well understand the dismay of Dodwell, and presumably other Nonjurors, at this defection from their ranks, for Lee was an honour to their cause. He had a high reputation at Oxford both for learning and character; on account of his knowledge of Oriental literature he was called 'Rabbi Lee,' as Smith was called 'Rabbi Smith'; and Hearne informs us that 'the Town's People of Oxon had a mighty opinion of him.'[1] Lee replied to Dodwell in the most humble and Christian spirit, as the first sentence will show:

> Most dear and worthy Sir,—I esteem myself exceedingly obliged to you both for the kindness and severity of your

[1] *Collections*, i. 338.

letter; and do heartily pray that in the day of recompense, this your most generous and Christian intention towards me in special, and towards the Church of Christ in general, may be had in remembrance before God, angels, and men. For I am not able to thank you sufficiently myself, but am confident this labour of love in you shall not lose its reward.

It is impossible to make further extracts from the correspondence, which ends with those touching words from Lee: 'I beseech you to believe, *Errare possum, hæreticus esse nolo.* And that my chiefest study is to be found a living and sound member of the Catholic Church.' The whole of it appears in that extraordinary repertory of information, Mr. Walton's 'Memorial of William Law,' pp. 188–232. The arguments of Mr. Dodwell, backed up by those of Mr. Edward Stephens, are supposed to have converted Lee. At any rate he returned to the communion of the Nonjurors, and was warmly welcomed by them. The Society of the Philadelphians was broken up in 1703, soon after the correspondence closed, and in 1709 Lee published a 'History of Montanism,' which was thought to re-establish his orthodoxy; but I doubt whether he ever gave up his belief in Mrs. Lead. His friend Roach certainly never did, and there is at any rate a vein of mysticism in Lee's later life which is probably due to the Philadelphian episode. The writer of the article on Lee in the 'Dictionary of National Biography' seems to me to hit the truth when he says: 'Lee then [after the breaking up of the Philadelphian Society] turned his activity to more practical schemes. His intimacy with the intensely practical Robert Nelson may have influenced him, as he on his part unquestionably influenced Robert Nelson.'[1] The two were very closely connected in their later life.

[1] See Mr. Abbey's remarks on this point in *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i. (of the original edition) ch. iii. 'Robert Nelson, his Friends, and Church Principles,' pp. 120–1.

They prepared together the manuscripts of J. E. Grabe, the learned Prussian, who was a friend of both, for publication. Lee is said to have been the first to suggest to Nelson the foundation of charity schools after the German plan, and to have helped him largely in the composition of his most famous work, 'A Companion to the Festivals and Fasts of the Church of England.' He was entrusted by Nelson with his papers before his death, and published in the same year (1715) from them the 'Address to Persons of State and Quality.' Nelson's friend Hickes seems to have had equal confidence in him, and it was from the papers of Hickes and Nelson that he compiled the biography of John Kettlewell, which gives us, perhaps, more information than any other single book about the early Nonjurors. By entrusting Nelson's papers to Lee it was probably intended that he should write his friend's life, but he did not live to execute the task. The following interesting notice is taken from the Rawlinson MSS. in the Bodleian: 'Easter Day, 1718, at the Oratory of his brother, *William Lee*, dyer, in Spital Fields, Dr. F. Lee read a touching and beautiful declaration of his faith betwixt offertory sentences and prayer for Christ's Church. It was addressed to the Rev. James Daillon, Count de Lude,'[1] then officiating. The only puzzling thing about this notice is its date. One can quite understand that Lee, after what some would call his escapade in the matter of the Philadelphian Society, would be required to rehabilitate himself by making a public declaration of his faith before 'claiming Catholic Communion,' which was the avowed object of the declaration; and also that it should be made at the oratory of his brother, who had felt himself,

[1] James Daillon, Count de Lude, was the ejected vicar of Wrawby, then, and until quite late years, the mother church of Brigg, a town of considerable size in North Lincolnshire.

as we have seen, socially as well as theologically aggrieved. But one certainly would have expected it earlier, and not three years after the deaths of Nelson and Hickes, who were quite the leading spirits among the Nonjurors, and had both taken Lee to their hearts years before.

Thomas Bowdler (1661–1738), though far less prominent than the rest, certainly belonged to that inner circle of Nonjurors which embraced the Shottesbrooke and the London groups, the principal members of which have been already described. He was a near neighbour of Nelson and Hickes in Great Ormond Street and an intimate friend of both. He was a Nonjuror in a sense in which from the nature of the case his friend Nelson could not be; for, holding an office under Government, he was able to testify to the sincerity of his principles by making a sacrifice for their sake of all his worldly prospects. He was in the Admiralty, next in position to Samuel Pepys, at the time when James, Duke of York, afterwards James II., was Lord High Admiral. James had, with all his faults, the true Stuart gift of winning the devoted attachment of those who were brought into personal contact with him; so when he lost the throne all the clerks of the Admiralty except one resigned office, Thomas Bowdler among the number. On the death of James his friends attempted to induce Bowdler to comply. But he had probably by this time come under the powerful influence of Dr. Hickes, who made and kept more men Nonjurors than any other person. To an urgent letter from his brother-in-law, adducing arguments why he should 'qualify himself for public business by taking the oaths,' Bowdler sent the following reply :—

> The report with you of the B. of G. [Frampton] is newes to mee, who have for some time lived close in the country, but I believe you will find hee is abused. As to B. of B. and W.

[Ken] you have a friend with you who knowes as much of his mind as another. And for D. of W. [Hickes] I believe I may say of him that hee will continue his present sentiments as long as he can distinguish right from wrong. They are all of the great and good examples which I shall be proud always to keep in my view.[1]

So Thomas Bowdler remained a Nonjuror until his death, which took place in Queen Square, in July 1738. The Nonjuring tradition remained in the family, and his grandson was one of the last of the body, and will be noticed in a future chapter. The Church principles of the Nonjurors were held by the Bowdlers within contemporary recollection.[2]

Next to Shottesbrooke—*longo sed proximus intervallo*—perhaps the most interesting country spot in connection with the Nonjurors is the village of Headley, or Hedly, in the beautiful district of Surrey, between Leatherhead and Epsom. It is associated with four Nonjurors: the two Bonwickes, father and son, Elijah Fenton, the poet, and William Bowyer, the printer.

Ambrose Bonwicke, the elder (1652–1722), received Holy Orders, and therefore properly belongs to the last, not to the present chapter; but he is so closely connected with the other three that it seemed to be a more awkward arrangement to separate him from them than to put him out of his proper place. Moreover, it is not in his clerical so much as in his tutorial capacity that he comes before us. Indeed, he never had any parochial charge, and the chief interest in him lies in the fact that he was father of Ambrose Bonwicke, the younger. He was the son of John Bonwicke, rector of Great Horsley, Surrey, and was

[1] *Memoir of John Bowdler, with some account of Thomas Bowdler*, p. 12. The 'John' and 'Thomas' of this *Memoir* were both descendants of the Nonjuror.

[2] See Archdeacon Churton's *Memoir of Joshua Watson*, i. 231, and *passim*.

educated at Merchant Taylors' School, and thence proceeded to St. John's College, Oxford, where he was successively scholar and fellow. In 1686 he was appointed head master of his old school by the Merchant Taylors' Company, who successfully resisted James II.'s infatuated policy when, *more suo*, he attempted to thrust in a creature of his own. But though James was no friend to him, Bonwicke was faithful in his allegiance. He was a successful head master, and great efforts were made to overcome his scruples and retain his services, but nothing could induce him to take the new oaths, so he had to be dismissed in 1691. He then set up a private school at Hedly, where he seems to have won the respect of all his pupils.

Ambrose Bonwicke, the younger (1692–1714), son of the above, had a rather touching story. He was brought up, of course, in the Nonjuring principles of his father, and was sent to his father's old school, Merchant Taylors', of which he rose to be captain. There was no doubt that, on his merits, he would have been elected to a scholarship at St. John's, Oxford, which, leading as it did to a fellowship, was the great ambition of Merchant Taylors' boys. But the head boys had to read the school prayers in turn; and one of these prayers was the first collect for the King or Queen in the Communion Office. It really looks as if this prayer had been selected as a test of loyalty; for it is not a prayer which one would naturally select for the use of schoolboys: and it was generally considered a criterion of a clergyman's loyalty whether he chose the first or the second collect for the sovereign, the first implying the recognition of a sovereign *de jure* as well as *de facto*, the second, not. Bonwicke, as a Nonjuror and the son of a Nonjuror, could not conscientiously use the prayer, so in spite of the reasonings and remon-

strances of his friends, he persistently omitted it. This reached the ears of the Company, who were the electors, and, when the election came on, though Bonwicke was admitted to have acquitted himself very well in every way, he was passed over with a compliment, thus becoming a Confessor in the Nonjuring cause at an earlier age than any of the little company. He was sent to St. John's, Cambridge, instead of St. John's, Oxford, and was quickly elected to a scholarship there. But here again his sensitive conscience troubled him. He had bound himself by an oath not only to observe the statutes himself, but to make others do so; and as he could not do this he was tempted to 'quit his scholarship' until his 'good friend Mr. R. freed him pretty well [but not altogether] from his scruples.' He positively died of conscientiousness; the amount of reading he went through, all of which is minutely recorded in the 'Life,' is perfectly appalling; he studied so hard, and lived so ascetic a life that the strain was too much for him. He died at the early age of twenty-two in his college rooms, with his devotional books beside him. The bereaved father was persuaded by William Bowyer[1] to write anonymously a touching little memoir of his extraordinarily promising son. It did not appear until 1729, seven years after the author's death, under the title of 'A Pattern for Young Students in the University, set forth in the Life of Mr. Ambrose Bonwicke, sometime Scholar of St. John's College, in Cambridge'; and in 1870 the little work was re-edited by Professor J. E. B. Mayor, with a most interesting address 'To the Reader' prefixed, and a large number of notes, which are a perfect mine of accurate information about Cambridge in the early eighteenth century.

[1] See *infra*, p. 261 *et seq.*

The next Nonjuror who was for a time connected with Headley took no part in the Nonjuring controversy, and is rarely or never mentioned by writers on the subject; but there was no more consistent member of the body.

Elijah Fenton (1683–1730) has the honour of a niche in that literary Valhalla, Dr. Johnson's 'Lives of the Poets,' and his personal character has found a warm admirer in the stout old dictator. To tell the truth, the man was better than the poet, whose effusions did not reach a high standard, even for that unpoetical age. But beyond a constitutional indolence, which his varied work shows that he must have made strenuous efforts to throw off, we hear nothing but good about the man. His father, John Fenton, was a gentleman of ancient family and good circumstances in Staffordshire; Elijah was the youngest of eleven children, and was sent to Jesus College, Cambridge, with a direct view to his becoming a clergyman and earning his living in that profession. Having taken his B.A. degree in 1704, he found that, though he was quite ready to acknowledge Queen Anne as his sovereign, he could not conscientiously take the Abjuration Oath; so the ministry of the Established Church was closed to him. In the stately language of Dr. Johnson:

> With many other wise and virtuous men, who at that time of discord and debate consulted conscience, whether well or ill informed, more than interest, he doubted the legality of the Government, and refusing to qualify himself for publick employment by the oaths required, left the University without a degree;[1] but I never heard that the enthusiasm of opposition impelled him to separation from the Church. By this perverseness of integrity he was driven out a commoner of Nature, excluded from the regular modes of profit and prosperity, and

[1] This is a mistake.

reduced to pick up a livelihood uncertain and fortuitous; but it must be remembered that he kept his name unsullied, and never suffered himself to be reduced, like too many of the same sect, to mean and dishonourable shifts.[1]

And he added in a later page: 'Of his morals and his conversation the account is uniform; he was never named but with praise and fondness, as a man in the highest degree amiable and excellent.'[2] Fenton gained a subsistence by various honourable employments. First he acted as secretary to the Earl of Orrery, Charles Boyle, the same who had waged a very unequal war with Bentley about the genuineness of the Epistles of Phalaris. Then he became assistant to Ambrose Bonwicke, the elder, in his school at Headley; then master of a school at Sevenoaks, which under him acquired some reputation; then we find him acting as tutor for six years to Lord Broghill, son of his former patron Lord Orrery; then in the strange capacity of instructor in literature to Craggs, the well-known Secretary of State, whose early education had been neglected, and who, by the advice of Alexander Pope, tried to improve himself under Fenton's direction, but died of small-pox very soon after; and finally in the household of Lady Trumbull, widow of Sir W. Trumbull, already noticed,[3] at Easthampstead, to whom he had been recommended by his faithful friend Pope. He acted as tutor to young Trumbull, and when the youth went to Cambridge, accompanied him thither as 'governor.' After the education was completed Lady Trumbull still retained him at Easthampstead as 'an auditor of accounts,' and there he died in August 1730.

Samuel Parker (1681–1730) was another quiet, scholarly man, like Fenton, who could not conscientiously

[1] *Lives of the Poets*, ii. 227, 'Fenton.' [2] *Ibid.* ii. 231.
[3] See *supra*, p. 223.

take the oaths, but was content to pursue the even tenour of his way without creating any disturbance in either Church or State. He was a son of that Bishop of Oxford who obtained a rather unenviable notoriety in the reign of James II.; but—like Diomede[1]—he was certainly 'better than his father'; for there was nothing in the career of the younger Samuel Parker which argued the self-seeking and flexibility of conscience so painfully manifest in the elder. He was educated at Trinity College, Oxford, and lived at Oxford all his life, marrying the daughter of Mr. Clements, a famous bookseller there. From the first he identified himself with the Nonjurors, and became a personal friend of their chief leaders. Like them he was a studious man, fond of literary pursuits, and produced several works of value, which will be noticed in their proper place. He was one of those few mysterious 'others,' besides the Shottesbrooke group, who were induced by the arguments of Dodwell to return to the National Church in 1710–1. But he resolutely declined to enter into controversy in print on the subject, did not, after his compliance, take Holy Orders, as it was expected that he would do, and died, it was said, from the effects of an over-sedentary life, July 14, 1730, at Oxford. In a brief 'Life' prefixed to the 1734 edition of his 'Bibliotheca Biblica' it is rather foolishly remarked that 'he had from the beginning embraced the principles of the Nonjurors, and constantly observed a strict uniformity in his principles and practice.' This, of course, roused the ire of a thorough-paced Nonjuror like Hearne, who wrote indignantly that it was false, for he had severed from the true old Nonjuring principles, forsaken his old friends, and so forth.[2]

[1] *Tydides melior patre*, Horace, *Odes*, i. 15. 28.

[2] See *Reliquiæ Hearnianæ*, iii. 178–9.

Printers, who were often also in those days what we should now call 'publishers,' were naturally a very important element in the Nonjuring economy; for, as the Nonjuring clergy were shut out of what were called 'the national pulpits,' and as they would be the very last to preach in any other pulpits except those of their own little oratories, where the congregation would be more select than numerous, they were forced to have recourse to the press as the only means of disseminating their views. They could use this means very effectively, for it is astonishing how exceptionally large a proportion of Nonjurors, both lay and clerical, could, and did, handle the pen of a ready writer. But printers would hardly be forthcoming unless they were more or less in sympathy with their authors' sentiments; for they had to run the risk of being prosecuted, and frequently *were* prosecuted and punished for printing seditious matter. By far the most important of those who performed this essential service was another Nonjuror who was connected with Headley.

William Bowyer (1663–1737) was the son of a London citizen, was apprenticed by his father to a printer, and followed that business through life. In 1686 he was admitted to the freedom of the Company of Stationers. In 1699 he set up for himself in Little Britain, but removed the same year to Dogwell Court, Whitefriars. From the first he must have been employed in printing the works of Nonjurors, for we are told that the works of Hickes and Nelson were all ushered into the world by Bowyer. Nelson 'had a peculiar regard for Mr. Bowyer,' and so had Charles Leslie. He rendered great service to the Nonjurors, not only by printing their books, but by employing Nonjuring clergymen, who were often at their wits' end to find any employment at all

remunerative, as correctors of the press for him. The Nonjurors had on one occasion a chance of showing their appreciation of his services in a very practical manner. At the close of January 1712–3, his printing office and dwelling in Dogwell Court were destroyed by fire, and Bowyer suffered a loss of more than five thousand pounds, which looked like ruin to a man in his position; for he was yet in a comparatively small way of business. But a Royal Brief was procured for him, and his friends rallied round him, especially the Nonjurors. Nelson, who had the means, helped him largely; while Ambrose Bonwicke, the elder, contributed in a very touching way. Bowyer had placed his son, known afterwards as 'the learned printer,' under Bonwicke's charge at Headley, induced probably by the fact that Bonwicke was a Nonjuror. After the catastrophe Bonwicke continued to board and educate the lad for a whole year without making any charge, and concealing from his father who was the benefactor. Bowyer more than recovered from his loss, and became, with the help of his son, whom he took into partnership in 1722, the most famous printer of the day. He thoroughly identified himself with the Nonjurors; for we find him present and signing his name as a witness at the consecration of at least two Nonjuring bishops in a Nonjuring oratory.

William Bowyer, the younger (1699–1777), was also a Nonjuror. 'The learned printer' was, of course, a far more highly educated man than his father; but, though he went as a sizar to St. John's College, Cambridge, in 1716, and won Roper's Exhibition in 1719, he never took his B.A. degree, finding, no doubt, the oaths an obstacle. This probably prevented him from gaining a fellowship there. His name occurs among the 'Matriculations, Graduations, &c., of Nonjurors in Cambridge,' sent by

Thomas Baker to Dr. Rawlinson; and he made no secret of his sentiments. It was he who persuaded his old master at Headley to write the 'Life of Ambrose Bonwicke,' and himself wrote the Preface to that Life when it was published in 1729; and in the same year he was appointed printer of the Votes of the House of Commons through the influence of Onslow, the Speaker. On that occasion Onslow was asked in the House whether he was aware that Bowyer was a Nonjuror, and replied, 'I am quite sure of this—that he is an honest man.' He was also a very religious and charitable man, of irreproachable life; and this work is largely indebted to him for the share he had in writing Nichols's 'Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century,' so often quoted herein. Another Nonjuring printer was James Bettenham, who was certainly also a Nonjuror himself, for we find him a member of the last congregation of regular Nonjurors in London under the ministry of Bishop Gordon.[1]

It is not so easy to label laymen as to label clergy Nonjurors, unless they held some office for which the taking of the oaths was a qualification. Those who held commissions in the army would, of course, come under this head, and we gather incidentally that there were officers in the army who lost their commissions as Nonjurors. Thus, when Kettlewell (December 20, 1694) wrote to Bishop Lloyd proposing that a fund should be raised for the relief of their clergy, he says: 'Were this a fund for the soldiery, though God knows many of them have need enough, it may be, some might fancy they could

[1] See *Political and Literary Anecdotes of His Own Times*, by Dr. Wm. King, Principal of St. Mary Hall, Oxon., p. 191, &c. King calls Bettenham 'a sanctified member of Gordon's congregation, but one of the greatest knaves I have ever known'; but then King had violently quarrelled with his old friends the Jacobites, and, moreover, had just had a lawsuit with James Bettenham.

with better colour charge it as a listing of men';[1] and Bishop Ken left in his will 'To the Deprived Officers the sum of Forty Pounds.'[2] But the names of military men are not prominent among the Nonjuring laity.

Schoolmasters, again, who required a licence from the bishop of the diocese, and could not be licensed without taking the oaths, would be legally bound to declare themselves, whether they were ordained or not. But the law does not seem to have been at all strictly enforced in their case, for we find several Nonjurors—Ambrose Bonwicke and Elijah Fenton, to wit—who had recourse to this occupation in order to gain a living. In December 1705 the subject came before Parliament in rather a curious way during the famous 'Church in Danger' debate.

My Lord W—n[3] in the House of Peers took notice that 'a certain noble Lord of that House had educated his sons at a seminary kept by a Nonjuror.' The Archbishop [of York, Dr. John Sharp] who perceived himself was pointed at, declared that although he had sent both his sons to Mr. Ellis's school, who was a sober, virtuous man, and a man of letters, yet he had qualified himself according to the laws, when they were sent to him. But as soon as he was informed that Mr. Ellis had refused to take the oaths he immediately took away his son, who then only remained with him, and removed him to another and unexceptionable place. And this was above three years before the complaint was made in the House of Peers, and was rather an instance of his dislike of those principles he was charged with abetting. Whereas others chose rather to run the hazard of such unreasonable censures and reflections than forego the advantages of so flourishing a school, and such an able instructor of their children. Thus did several persons of note and distinction, without being thought inclinable to Jacobitism.[4]

James Ellis, the Nonjuror in question, was a graduate of Oriel College, Oxford, but does not appear to have

[1] Quoted by Plumptre, *Life of Ken*, ii. 96. [2] *Ibid.* ii. 208.
[3] Wharton. [4] *Life of John Sharp, Archbishop of York*, p. 269.

taken Holy Orders. He is described in lists of Nonjurors simply as 'Schoolmaster of Thistleworth' (Isleworth), near the Thames, in Middlesex. Hearne twice refers to him as a successful and high-class schoolmaster at Thistleworth.[1] Thomas Jacomb, master of the Free School, Coleshill, also a layman, followed the example of his saintly vicar, John Kettlewell, and became a Nonjuror; and Jonathan Moor, 'Schoolmaster at Long Melford,' following probably the example of *his* parish priest, Nathanael Bisbie, did the same; and so did George Speed, 'Master of the School in St. Mary Axe,' London, Henry Johnson, 'Master of Wandsworth School,' and Thomas Lee, master of the famous school of St. Saviour's, Southwark.

In a lower grade there would probably be many teachers in the charity schools who were Nonjurors at heart; for there was a widespread impression, which could hardly be without some foundation, that these excellent institutions tended to become nurseries of Jacobitism. Bishop Gibson, for instance, was the last man to make reckless and unfounded statements, and he distinctly affirms that 'while the Protestant succession was doubtful some persons, otherwise virtuous and good men, endeavoured to get the management of charity schools into their hands, and to make them instrumental in rousing and spreading an aversion to the Protestant Settlement.'[2] Archbishop Wake also complains of an attempt of the sort in 1716; and in an account of the riots which took place in London on May 28 and 29 (the King's birthday and the Restoration anniversary) we are told that 'among the noisiest and most violent of the

[1] See *Collections*, i. 19 and ii. 9.

[2] *Instructions to Masters and Mistresses of Charity Schools*, 1724; also Gibson's printed *Charges*, p. 145, and Skeat's *History of the Free Churches*, p. 272.

Jacobite mob were the charity school boys. . . . . It was said the masters and mistresses poisoned the children with principles which would lead to the gallows. Boys were told that the institution from which they derived so much advantage was about to be abolished.'[1]

The medical profession numbered some Nonjuring clergy, two of whom were bishops, among its ranks, and also some Nonjuring laymen of great distinction. One has been already noticed, Francis Lee, whom it was thought better not to separate from his friend and coadjutor, Robert Nelson, particularly as he does not appear to have practised medicine in England. But he certainly studied medicine at Leyden, took an M.D. degree, and practised in Venice, and also became some years later (1708) a licentiate of the College of Physicians in London. *Roger Kenyon*[2] also, one of the ejected fellows of St. John's, Cambridge, became physician at the Court of St. Germains, first to James II. and then to his son, James Francis. There he formed an intimate friendship with Charles Leslie, and it is to Kenyon more than any one else that we owe the collection and publication of Leslie's very valuable theological works. In 1719, when Leslie felt that his sands of life were running out, he expressed a wish that his *theological* (not, be it observed, as characteristic of the Nonjurors' position, his *political*) works might be collected and published 'for the good of the Church of England.' He communicated his desire to Roger Kenyon, who took up the matter warmly, wrote to his friends in England, and enlisted among others the services of William Bowyer, who collected large subscriptions. The result was the publication, in 1721, of the two

[1] *London in the Jacobite Times*, i. 236–7.

[2] In Thomas Baker's letter to Dr. Rawlinson on the 'Matriculations &c. of Nonjurors at Cambridge' we find '*Kenyon* (Roger), Lancastriensis, admissus Socius Coll. Joh. Mar. 15, 1686/7.'

folio volumes dedicated to 'R. K.'—that is, of course, Roger Kenyon.[1] Roger was the brother of George Kenyon, of Peel House, Lancashire, whose valuable MSS. are now at Gredington, in the possession of the present Lord Kenyon. There is also among the 'Matriculations, &c., of Nonjurors in the University of Cambridge' another Roger Kenyon, who graduated B.A. in 1685, 'nec ultra progreditur'[2]—no doubt because he could not take the oaths.

Another distinguished member of the medical profession who became a Nonjuror was *James Henry Paman* (1626–95). He had been early trained in the principles which led to this result, for in his undergraduate days he was a pupil at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, of William Sancroft, with whom he contracted a lifelong friendship. He was afterwards elected fellow of St. John's College, and became one of the famous *socii ejecti* at the first deprivation. He seems always to have had the medical profession in view, for having graduated in Arts he kept an Act for a medical degree in 1656, graduated M.D. in 1658, and was incorporated M.D. at Oxford in 1659. He was Senior Proctor at Cambridge in 1656, elected Public Orator in 1674, and held that office until 1681; he was appointed Professor of Physics at Gresham College in 1679, was elected F.R.S. in the same year, and fellow of the College of Physicians in 1687. In 1677 he went to live at Lambeth with his old college tutor, Sancroft, then Archbishop of Canterbury, and in 1684 graduated LL.D. at Cambridge, and was appointed by Sancroft Master of the Faculties. It will thus be seen that he had a distinguished career, but he had no hesitation about resigning his mastership and following his friend and mentor into

[1] See a most interesting article, by the Hon. Mrs. Bulkeley-Owen (mother of the present Lord Kenyon), in *The Newbery House Magazine* for July 1893, and the Rev. R. J. Leslie's *Life of Charles Leslie*, p. 508, and *passim*.

[2] T. Baker to Dr. Rawlinson, *ut supra*.

retirement when the archbishop refused the oaths. During the last few years of his life he lived in the parish of St. Paul's, Covent Garden, and was buried in St. Paul's Church.

Samuel Jebb (1694–1772) was another Nonjuror who embraced the medical profession. He was educated at Mansfield Grammar School and St. Peter's College, Cambridge, with a view to his taking Holy Orders; and, joining the Nonjurors, he was ordained deacon and priest by Collier. He is said to have found employment as librarian to Collier in London, and this tallies with the fact that most of the letters sent by the Nonjuring bishops (of whom Collier was 'Primus') between 1716 and 1725 to the Eastern Patriarchs were 'done into Latin by Mr. Jebb.'[1] In 1726 Collier died, whereupon Jebb, on the advice of the famous Dr. Mead, directed his attention to medicine and became a successful physician at Stratford-le-Bow. He was also a good classical scholar and a diligent writer on a variety of subjects, but none of his writings were connected with the Nonjuring question.

Sir Richard Jebb (1729–89), son of the above, was also another physician who was a Nonjuror, and in consequence could not graduate at Oxford. He was highly distinguished in his profession.

In the legal profession the first Nonjuror to be mentioned is *Hugh Wynne*, fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford, who took the degree of B.C.L. in 1667 and D.C.L.

[1] See the interesting paper of the present Bishop of Edinburgh (Dr. Dowden), in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. i., entitled 'Note on the Original Documents containing, or relating to, the Proposals of the Nonjuring Bishops for a "Concordate" with the Holy Orthodox Church of the East.' One of these 'Original Documents' contains the information in the text about Dr. Jebb. The notice of Jebb's ordination in the Rawlinson MSS. runs thus: '1716, July 25th—Mr. Samuel Jebb, B.A., of Peterhouse in Cambridge, ord. d. in Mr. Gandy's Chapell by Mr. Collier [Witnesses]. Preist Jan. 23, $17\frac{17}{18}$ in Mr. Laurence's Chapel by Mr. Collier' [Witnesses].

in 1672, and afterwards became Chancellor of the Diocese of St. Asaph. Dr. Wynne had the honour of being the first to suffer at Oxford for conscience' sake, and for that reason appears to have been an object of great interest to Hearne. He lived on quietly at Oxford, where he died in the parish of St. Giles, November 9, 1720.[1] Another Nonjuring lawyer was Richard Jones, of Jesus College, Oxford, who took his B.C.L. degree in 1674 and D.C.L. in 1679, and became Chancellor of the Dioceses of Bangor and of Llandaff. A third is described as 'Pearce of Took's Court, a well-known Nonjuring attorney and an agent for the Nonjuring party'; but however 'well known' he may once have been, he appears now to be only known in connection with a rather ghastly story. He is said to have picked up the head of Christopher Layer, the Jacobite conspirator, when it was blown down from Temple Bar, and to have sold it at a high price to Dr. Rawlinson, but the story rests on slender foundations.[2]

A fourth and far more distinguished Nonjuring lawyer was *Roger North* (1653–1734), youngest son of Dudley, fourth Lord North. In 1678 he became, on Sancroft's appointment, Steward of the See of Canterbury, and legal adviser to the archbishop; in 1684 Solicitor-General to James, Duke of York; and in 1686 Attorney-General to the Queen, Mary of Modena. At the Revolution he did not desert his old friends, but became a Nonjuror at the sacrifice of a large professional income. Like so many Nonjurors he retired quietly into the country, and, eschewing politics, lived for thirty-five years at Rougham in Norfolk (still the seat of his descendants), usefully occupying his leisure

[1] See *Reliquiæ Hearnianæ*, ii. 113–4, and Hearne's *Collections*, iii. 409.

[2] See Doran's *London in the Jacobite Times*, i. 436; Nichols's *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*; and article on Rawlinson in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

with agriculture, literary pursuits, and music, giving his neighbours the benefit of his legal knowledge when any dispute had to be settled. Like Cherry, he is an instance of the cultured country gentleman. His valuable writings will be noticed in the chapter on the general literature of the Nonjurors.

Nonjuring laymen were to be found among all classes. James Millington, whose munificence founded the hospital and charity school which still bear his name at Shrewsbury, was a draper in that town, and died in 1737. The whole family of Matthews, printers in the City of London, but of a much humbler type than the Bowyers, were Nonjurors, and one member suffered death in the cause of the Stuarts. Many belonged to the class of country gentry. Among those who were taken prisoners in the struggle of 1715, Patten (who, having changed sides, has naturally seldom a word of praise for any of his old party) speaks very highly of one Robert Cotton, 'a gentleman of very good fortune, a Nonjuror.'[1] This is probably the same Robert Cotton whose name is found as a witness to the consecration of some Nonjuring bishops. Whether he was a relation of Sir John Hynde Cotton, the Jacobite politician, or of the Sir John Cotton who inherited the Cottonian Library, and with whom Thomas Smith found a home as already described,[2] I am unable to say. Another of the same class was Ralph Lowndes, of Lea Hall, Cheshire, which had been in the possession of the family for some generations. His name has become very familiar to all students of Nonjuring literature from the fact that his 'Penitential Declaration,' in which he declared his 'sincere repentance for his sin

[1] *History of the late Rebellion*, by the Rev. Robert Patten, formerly Chaplain to Mr. Forster (1717), pp. 149–50.

[2] See *supra*, p. 176.

and weakness in having been induced by the general Example of men of reputed Prudence and Integrity' to take the oath, is inserted in an Appendix to Kettlewell's 'Life.' He is there described as 'Ralph Lowndes of Middlewich, gentleman.' There was another Ralph Lowndes, also a Cheshire man, the rector of Eccleston, who was deprived in 1690. Whether the layman and the clergyman were related is not known, but the coincidence is very striking if they were not.[1] Another Cheshire gentleman, who is said by Oldmixon to have been sent to the Tower as a Nonjuring member of the House of Commons, was Francis Cholmondeley, of Vale Royal, in Cheshire. He was at any rate a kind friend and patron of Nonjurors, and wrote a Latin epitaph on a monument which he erected to the memory of John Oakes, deprived vicar of Whitegate, in Eccleston Church, which could hardly have been written by any but a Nonjuror.[2] The Cholmondeleys were a sort of link between the gentry and the nobility; so we naturally pass on to some of the latter class, who were either Nonjurors themselves or, at least, friends and patrons of Nonjurors.

Among these the first place must, of course, be assigned to the one who was nearest the throne, *Henry Hyde, second Earl of Clarendon* (1638–1709). He was certainly in the literal sense of the term 'a Nonjuror,' for he persistently declined to take the new oaths; but he was sorely tried. On the one side was his brother-in-law, James II., to whom he owed no obligation from the time—one might, indeed, say from *before* the time—when James had married his sister; on the other side were his own nieces, Mary and Anne, to whom he was always attached. He was, like his father, a thorough

[1] See *The Cheshire Sheaf*, No. 80, for August 1896.
[2] *Ibid.* No. 84, where the epitaph is given in full.

Church of England man, and therefore quite as much opposed to the Romanism of James as to the latitudinarianism of William; and the new type of Churchmanship of Tillotson and Burnet was very unlike that wherein he had been brought up. His 'Diary' gives us a most graphic account of the crisis which led to the Nonjuring separation. If Hearne is to be trusted, his end was very sad: 'He almost wanted bread to eat.'[1]

Thomas Thynne, first Viscount Weymouth (1640–1714), though not a Nonjuror himself, is closely identified with the party, owing chiefly, but not solely, to his connection with Bishop Ken. His career was rather a peculiar one, for he was actually one of the four lords sent to convey the invitation, drawn up at the memorable Guildhall meeting in 1688, to the Prince of Orange to come over and undertake the government; but he was in favour of the Regency scheme, and never cordially accepted William and Mary as his sovereigns. Indeed, until the accession of Queen Anne the 'characteristick' prayers do not appear to have been used in his private chapel at Longleat, where a Nonjuring chaplain always officiated. His early training was of a kind to make him a strong Churchman. As nephew of Dorothy, Lady Pakington, he was brought into contact with the old Church and Royalist traditions of Westwood; he was educated at Christ Church, Oxford, under the direction of Fell and Hammond, and his undergraduate friends were evidently the Church set, for it was at Oxford that he commenced his life-long friendship with Ken, then an undergraduate at New College. His marriage with Lady Frances Finch, daughter of the second Earl of Winchilsea, would tend to strengthen the impressions previously made. His tastes were theological, and the important additions he made to the

[1] *Collections*, ii. 297.

splendid library at Longleat consist chiefly of theological works. Two successive chaplains at Longleat, Robert Jenkin and George Harbin, were strong men, and would be sure to make their influence felt; and then, to crown all, there was Thomas Ken, his honoured guest for nearly twenty years. Lord Weymouth always treated Ken with the greatest hospitality, consideration, and kindness, allowing him an annuity of 80*l.* for the capital sum of 700*l.*, which was all that the deprived prelate possessed, and assigning him apartments of his own at Longleat. It was rather a trouble to the good bishop when, on the accession of Queen Anne, prayers for the reigning Sovereign began to be used in Longleat Chapel. 'I shall spend this summer,' he writes to Bishop Lloyd, 'God willing, most at Longleat, though I am now very uneasy there; not but that my Lord is extremely kind to me, but because I cannot go to prayers there, by reason of the late alteration, which is no small affliction to me.'[1] But Ken's attachment to his patron remained unbroken to the end, and some years after his complaint of uneasiness at Longleat he compared his happy retreat there to that of Gregory of Nazianzum in the touching Dedication of the first volume of his poems to Lord Weymouth:

> When I, my Lord, crush'd by prevailing Might,
> No cottage had where to direct my Flight;
> Kind Heav'n me with a Friend Illustrious blest,
> Who gives me Shelter, Affluence, and Rest;
> In this alone I Gregory outdo,
> That I much happier Refuge have in you;
> Where to my Closet I to Hymn retire,
> On this side Heav'n have nothing to desire.
> . . . . . .
> I the small dol'rous Remnant of my Days,
> Devote to hymn my great Redeemer's Praise;

[1] See Plumptre's *Life of Ken*, ii. 124.

I, nearer as I draw towards Heavenly Rest,
The more I love th' Employment of the blest.
In that Employment while my Hours I spend,
This Prayer I offer for my Noble Friend,
Whose shades benign to sacred Songs invite,
Who to those Songs may claim Paternal Right:
Rich as He is in all good Works below,
May He in Heav'nly Treasure overflow!

The last line but one reminds us that there were others besides Ken who were under obligations to Lord Weymouth. We have already seen how he sent 100*l.* to Hilkiah Bedford when he was fined and imprisoned; Hearne always writes as if Nonjurors would be sure of finding a friend in Lord Weymouth, and, indeed, expresses his personal obligations to him;[1] and he joined with Robert Nelson in actively promoting the scheme of charity schools.

But Lord Weymouth's connection by marriage, *Heneage Finch, fourth Earl of Winchilsea*, though he is less known as a friend of Nonjurors, identified himself more closely with them than Lord Weymouth ever did. We find his name as an attesting witness at the consecration of more than one Nonjuring bishop; he supplied, as we have seen, a home for one of them, Samuel Hawes, after he was deprived of the living of Braybrooke; and Hearne distinctly calls him, as he never calls Lord Weymouth, a Nonjuror.[2] He died at Eastwell, his seat in Kent, September 30, 1726; and in the *Newcastle Courant* appeared an obituary notice, supposed to have been written by Mr. Harbin, in which it is said:

Above all, he is to be valued for the noble example he has given the world by a life eminently conformable to the strictest

[1] See *Collections*, iii. 220, 468.

[2] *Ibid.* iii. 427. 'A very honest Worthy Nonjuror to y^e^ great joy and content of y^e^ writer of these matters.'

rules of honour and religion. At the time of the Revolution, being Gentleman of the Bedchamber and a Colonel of the Guard to King James II., he was one of those resolute gentlemen that could not be persuaded that his Loyalty ought to terminate with his Prince's prosperity, and therefore chose to deny himself all those advantages in Life, which his Birth, his great Virtues and many excellent qualities, intitled him unto, rather than abate any of that constancy and fidelity which he thought it became him to maintain to the last period of his life.

His wife, who died in 1720, was a kindred spirit.

There were other noblemen who were more or less connected with the Nonjurors. The Earl of Exeter received into his family as domestic chaplain Robert Jenkin after he was ejected from his preferments in 1690 and before he went to Longleat;[1] John Oakes, the ejected vicar of Whitegate, Cheshire, went from Vale Royal to Eaton Hall, the seat of the Grosvenors, where he stayed until his death.[2] If Jacobite and Nonjuror were convertible terms (which they are not) something would also have to be said about James, second Duke of Ormonde, who was the head of the Jacobites; but, though he was a staunch Church of England man, he does not appear to have had much connection with the Nonjurors.

There were several other distinguished laymen who were in strong sympathy with the party, though they were not actual Nonjurors in the sense in which the term is used in this work. The two famous diarists, Samuel Pepys and John Evelyn, come under this head. Pepys quietly retired into private life when James II. lost his crown; and when he felt that he was nearing his end, and required spiritual ministration, would have none but Nonjuring clergy to minister to him; so he applied to

[1] *History of St. John's College, Cambridge*, by T. Baker, edited by J. E. B. Mayor, p. 998.

[2] See *The Cheshire Sheaf*, No. 84, p. 75.

Robert Nelson, who recommended Nathanael Spinckes; and Spinckes became his spiritual adviser. He received his last *viaticum* from Hickes, who also officiated at his funeral in Crutched Friars Church (St. Olave's, Hart Street), whither his corpse was removed from Clapham in 1703. John Evelyn had evidently strong sympathy with the 'deprived Fathers,' with some of whom he was on terms of great intimacy; and he was so far dissatisfied with the Revolution that he henceforth lived like Pepys in greater retirement; but he was not properly speaking a Nonjuror. Anthony Wood, the antiquary, tells us that 'people said he was a Jacobite and favoured the Nonjurors,'[1] and there were certainly some grounds for the impeachment, but he was never recognised by the Nonjurors proper as one of their body.

Instead, therefore, of dwelling on such doubtful cases it will be better to conclude this chapter with some extracts from a letter among the Rawlinson MSS., which illustrates vividly the anomalous position in which a Nonjuring layman sometimes found himself. The name and address of the writer are given in full, but have been so carefully obliterated that it is quite impossible to decipher them. The letter runs as follows:

To my neighbours the inhabitants of the parish of [illegible] and to my friends and acquaintance elsewhere, if any such shall happen to read these papers.

I suppose it is by this time known to most of you that are inhabitants of the parish of [illegible] that I have left the Parish Church because I was wont to meet you there heretofore with some degree of constancy, but now have been absent about twelve months, from which it seems you have taken the freedom to talk what you pleas'd, but very variously concerning me, some saying that I have become a papist, others a quaker and the like, and others that I absent myself to avoid praying for K. W. and the parliament, nay some by their malice have been

[1] See Wood's *Life and Times* (Oxf. Hist. Soc.), iii. 398.

carried so far as to insinuate that I was privy to the late plot.[1] Others, more favourable, wonder that so constant a frequenter of the Church (as they now please to account me) should at last quite forsake her, these aspersions, together with mine own inclination to satisfie my friends, made me soon resolve to offer something in mine own vindication, which I had done long agoe but that by a bodily indisposition I was hinder'd from this performance.

Then, after saying how cruel it was to accuse him of being a papist, which would expose him to the fury of the mob:

If you will needs have me to be a papist, and there is no help for it, I must tell you that I am such a papist as disowns the Pope's supremacy over the Catholick Church, such a papist as disbelieves his infallibility both in and out of a general Council, such a papist as disbelieves the corporall presence of Christ in the Sacrament, such a papist as cannot worship images, such a papist as abhorres divine service in a tongue unknown to the congregation, and if you will have any more, such a papist as detests one part of popery which is the deposing doctrine that many of you most zealously defend, tho' our divines used to tell us it was one of the most odious parts of popery.

As much a papist as I am reputed to be, . . . I declare that I am (notwithstanding my leaving the publick places of worship) as much a protestant as ever, as much a Church of England man as ever, as much as any of you.

Then as to my being accounted a quaker or fanatick, or the like, I suppose I need not make any defence, because a man may be of any religion or of none if he please so that he be not a papist. I say that he may be now-a-days of any religion but a papist, except it be a thing called a Jacobite, which is accounted somewhat worse. . . . .

I hope I shall make it pretty plain to you that I have not left the Church tho' I come not to the usuall place of worship. The Church, I suppose, is not confined to any particular place. The Church, I believe, remains with, or in the Bishops that adhere to the doctrine of the Church notwithstanding their illegall or invalid deprivation, which is of no force to dissolve

[1] The Preston Plot.

the relation between them and their flocks, for I cannot for my life conceive how the children can deprive their fathers, the sheep their shepherds, or the subjects their superiors in any ecclesiastical or civil society.

Some of you may think that I am possest with a belief of King James' return, and if that should happen I may hope for preferment under him [the return is unlikely], but if I were sure it would be so yet that would not justify me in leaving your communion. There is something else to bar me, as you shall know by and by. . . .

But suppose it should be granted that I do desire the King's return, what advantage shall I make by it? You know that I am neither courtier nor soldier nor anything else that I know of whereby to deserve any favour of the King. . . . If I had a revelation from heaven that the King will never be restored, yet I should be what now I am in matters relating to worship.

It is very plain that the Church is divided; it is too evident there is a schism among us; I mean in the Church of England: her bishops are divided, her priests are divided, her people are divided, one part going one way, and the other another . . . both parties call each other schismatics to the great scandall of the Church of England in particular, and of the Christian religion in general.

He then puts forcibly and racily the usual arguments to show that the parties who *change* are those who make the schism, and that lay deprivations are invalid, and proceeds:

Tho' I happen to be singular in the parish where I live, yet there are many in other places, I think I may say in all parts of the nation of my opinion.

Our deprived clergy are known to be well studied, men of great abilities and depth of learning, and not only so, but for the honour of our cause are men of extraordinary piety and integrity, so that their adversaries cannot but speak in their praise, men of undaunted courage, unshaken constancy, steady in all trials to their old principles, firm to that ancient doctrine of the Church of England which they and their professed adversaries once agreed to be true.

[As to their adversaries] how shall we reconcile their doctrines in the late reigns with their practice since?

Some may say I have nothing or little to lose. . . . Yet my ancestors had a plentifull estate, not only as good as any in the parish, but the best by far, except the rectory and the mannors, but the zeal of those pure times in which they lived eat [*sic*] up a great part thereof, else it might have been preserved entire till my time, it was their fault, it seems, to be firm to the King's interest, they were (as the great Sherlock is pleas'd to shew) men of stupid and slavish loyalty. . . .

. . . It has been easy to observe since I left you, how your carriage towards me has changed, some, when they meet me, refusing to open their lips, others looking another way that they might avoid speaking, others seeming not to see me, others gazing rudely on me as if I were some monster. . . .

I cannot but be persuaded that right is right notwithstanding want of success, and all other discouragements it may meet with, and that wrong is wrong, tho' it be never so prosperous and successfull, nor can I like any cause the better for having a multitude on its side, or the worse for being countenanced by a few.

But if the worship at the Parish Church be sinfull, why did I not leave it sooner, but continue to join in it three or four years after it became sinfull? I answer, when any doubt arises on religious matters, nothing should be resolv'd upon rashly. It was some years before works justifying our deprived fathers came into my hands. That I was unfixt long before is known, particularly to the minister of our parish.

Now if after all that I have said any of you shall charge me with leaving the religion of the Church of England, I do here solemnly profess that I have not left it, but what I have done proceeds from a steadfastness in the doctrine and communion of it, and if this be not sufficient, I challenge you and all the world besides to prove that I have departed in any, the least instance from her ancient doctrine, and that is more than you that railed at the deprived can say for yourselves tho' you go never so constantly to the publick worship.

[Signature in full, but carefully erased.]

Aug. y^{e} 10th 1696.

Then follows a postscript describing a Jacobite, in which the writer clearly intimates that he is one himself.

CHAPTER VI

NONJURING MODES OF WORSHIP

THE principles of the Nonjurors of course led them to attach the deepest importance to the details of public worship, and their internal disputes about these details more than anything else led to their decay and downfall; for a small community quite at variance with the spirit of the age cannot afford to have disputes among its own members, and that was just what the Nonjurors had. From the first there were differences among them connected directly or indirectly with public worship. All thought that at the Revolution it was unlawful to take the new oaths; but then another question immediately arose. Was it necessary that because they differed from their fellow Churchmen upon a political point they should hold aloof from common worship with them? Even their leaders, the deprived Fathers, were not all of one mind on this question. Archbishop Sancroft, when asked by some who worshipped at Lambeth Chapel in the interval between his suspension and deprivation whether they might attend the services of the Established Church, replied that 'if they did, they would need Absolution at the end, as well as at the beginning of the service;' and he himself acted consistently with this principle; for, after his retreat to Fressingfield, he wrote (December 23, 1691): 'I constantly officiate myself *secundum usum Lambethenum*, and never give the Holy Sacrament but to those of my own persuasion and practice;'[1] and

[1] D'Oyly's *Life of Sancroft*, ii. 19.

he never attended the parish church, though the clergyman of the parish frequently visited him.[1] Bishop Frampton, on the other hand, regularly 'went to the public prayers of the Church' at Standish, in spite of the expostulations of Mr. Dodwell.[2] Other Nonjurors followed Frampton's example, and this drew from Jeremy Collier a stirring and spirited appeal, entitled in brief 'A Persuasive to Royalists.'[3] Mr., afterwards Bishop, Hawes wrote on the same subject advocating the same line.[4] Two of the most highly and universally respected of all the later Nonjurors, Thomas Baker and William Law, always attended the national worship, and Charles Leslie, when there was no Nonjuring service at hand, went with his family to the parish church.[5]

The Nonjurors, however, as a rule much preferred services of their own, and the majority of them would attend no others. To discover, therefore, the various Nonjuring places of worship, which they sometimes called 'oratories,' sometimes 'chapels,' is an interesting task, but at the same time a most difficult one. For necessity compelled them to keep their places of meeting secret; they were liable at any moment to be interrupted, to have the oaths tendered to them, and, if they refused them, as of course they would, to be hurried off to prison. It was, therefore, adding insult to injury to taunt them contemptuously with the secrecy of their worship, for they could not help themselves. The poet laureate himself (N. Rowe)

[1] Lathbury's *History of the Nonjurors*, p. 100.

[2] See *Life of Bishop Frampton*, edited by Simpson Evans, p. 203.

[3] The full title is, *A Persuasive to Consideration Tendered to the Royalists, particularly those of the Church of England.* Second Edition. 1695.

[4] *Considerations—What a Christian is to do who goes into a country or place where the Clergy is unwarrantable or the Worship Corrupt, or both?* by Rev. Mr. Samuel Hawes, among the Rawlinson MSS.

[5] See R. J. Leslie's *Life of Charles Leslie*, p. 231.

in his Prologue to Colley Cibber's play, 'The Nonjuror,' complains that:

> Each lurking pastor seeks the dark,
> And fears the Justices' inquiring clerk.
> In close back rooms his routed flocks he rallies
> And reigns the patriarch of blind lanes and alleys.
> There safe he lets his thundering censures fly,
> Unchristians, damns us, gives our laws the lie
> And excommunicates three stories high.

What may be fairly called the first Nonjuring places of worship were the private chapels of the two Nonjuring prelates, Sancroft and Turner, at Lambeth and Ely House respectively. The services at Ely House in especial attracted much attention and aroused alarm. Bishop Turner used to officiate there every Sunday in his robes even after his deprivation; (it will be remembered that the sees were not filled up till a year later, so the chapel was vacant). His ministry was attended by so large a congregation that the new sovereigns were highly displeased, and the Bishop of St. Asaph (Dr. Lloyd), who still kept up his friendship with his brother confessors in the Tower, though they took different roads at the Revolution, was commissioned to tell him that he must shut the chapel up; but it was not until Turner had received a second intimation of the danger he incurred that he reluctantly consented to do so. Lord Clarendon was a regular worshipper at Ely House Chapel. When Sancroft left Lambeth the chapel there, of course, ceased to be available.

But in London, at any rate, Nonjuring places of worship abounded for many years. Bishop Nicolson, of Carlisle, writes in great alarm to the Archbishop of Canterbury (Wake) on September 20, 1716, declaring, among other things, that there were *fifty churches* of Nonjurors in London.[1] This is probably either an

[1] See Ellis's *Original Letters*, Series iii.

exaggeration, or else it includes private houses where few, if any, besides the family worshipped; but still there is evidence enough of the existence of many chapels or oratories in the metropolis. One of the most noted was in Scroop's Court, afterwards Union Court, near St. Andrew's Church, Holborn, where Hickes, Gandy and Grascome successively officiated. Another was on College Hill, where Roger Laurence, afterwards a bishop, was minister; another called Trinity Chapel, in the parish of St. Botolph Without, Aldersgate, where first Robert Orme officiated, and afterwards John Lindsay 'until his death in 1768,' so that this must have been one of the last remaining chapels of the Nonjurors in London; another in an 'upper room' in Broad Street, where Jeremy Collier, assisted sometimes by Samuel Carte, used to officiate; another in 'the Savoy'; another in Spitalfields, which is called the oratory of William Lee, dyer, brother of Francis Lee, the opening of which in 1716 caused a riot;[1] another in Gray's Inn, where Richard Rawlinson and John Blackbourne officiated, and where several ordinations took place; another in Goodman's Fields, in the parish of Whitechapel, where Welton, ex-rector of Whitechapel, was minister; this must have been a large building, for when it was invaded by the civil authority in 1717, two hundred and fifty persons were assembled there; another in 'Bedford Court, Holbourne,' where Matthias Earbery was minister; another in Fetter Lane, about which more will be said presently; another perhaps in Great Ormond Street, for Ralph Thoresby speaks of visiting Nelson and Hickes there and finding Hickes at 'the Nonjuring Conventicle,' though it has been suggested that 'probably the Conventicle was at one of their houses;'[2] another in

[1] See *London in the Jacobite Times*, i. 269.

[2] See *Notes and Queries*, Series i. vol. ii. No. 52, October 26, 1850.

Dunstan Court, Fleet Street, where a Dr. Bryan[1] is said to have officiated; and one in or near Theobald's Road, where Bishop Gordon ministered to the very last Nonjuring congregation of the regular line in London. These fall very far short of Bishop Nicolson's fifty, but they are enough to show that Nonjuring chapels were pretty numerous in London; and it may fairly be presumed that there were more than those mentioned, for the chief reason why we know anything about *these* is because their ministers were more or less well-known men. It is in every case the man who brings note to the oratory, not the oratory to the man; when the minister of an oratory was not known, the oratory would not be.

We cannot, however, argue from London to the country. Nathanael Marshall, in his 'Defence of our Constitution in Church and State' (p. 170), remarks that the chief efforts of the Nonjurors were confined to London, and the preceding pages sufficiently show how the party tended to gravitate to the metropolis as a centre. It appears also that Nonjurors used to come up to London on great festivals to attend services which they could not have in the country. This point is illustrated in a curious 'Dialogue,' published in 1756, but probably applicable with still greater force to an earlier period when the Nonjurors were a less minute and more flourishing community. If the writer was, as is conjectured, John Lindsay, the pamphlet is of more value as coming from an eminent and responsible person. At any rate it is worth quoting as illustrative of the attitude of the Nonjurors towards public worship. It is entitled 'The Grand and Important Question about the Church and Parochial Communion, Fairly and Friendly debated in a Dialogue

[1] Qy.—Matthew Bryan, formerly rector of Limington, Somerset?

between a worthy Country Gentleman and his Neighbour newly returned from London,' and runs:

C. G. Welcome home, Neighbour? What news do you bring from London?

N. News, Sir! I met with none; being otherways better employed while I stayed there.

C. G. Seeing you set out so early yesterday morning, I did not doubt but some extraordinary business called you abroad on such a solemn day as Easter Sunday.

N. It was indeed the *Business of the Day* that called me to London, which, I thank God, I have despatched to my great comfort and satisfaction.

C. G. I always understood the proper Business of such a Day to be the Service of God, and particularly at the Church; which (you will give me leave to say) seems hardly consistent with a London journey of so many miles.

N. . . . The only business and occasion of my going yesterday was in order to God's Service in the Church; which I would never neglect, on the more solemn Festivals, at least, tho' Providence has now placed me where I am not in a Capacity of attending it so frequently and constantly as would be most agreeable both to my inclination and duty. . . .

C. G. I suppose then, Sir, you are so zealously affected with the solemn Choir Service at St. Paul's or Westminster-Abbey that you cannot relish the plain service at a Country Church. For I do not remember to have ever seen you at our Parish Church, which has made many of us conclude you are not a member of the established Church of England.

N. I assure you, Sir, it is far otherwise. I really am, and trust in God to enable me steadfastly to continue a member of the Established Church of England, as it was happily reformed from the errors of Popery, and distinguished in Doctrine by her 39 Articles and Homilies, in Discipline by her Canons, and in worship according to her Liturgy or Common Prayer, maturely settled by Church Representation in Convocation in 1661, and enforced by the temporal Sanction of the Laws of the Land in the Act of Uniformity.

C. G. . . . I hope we may cement our friendship by going together to worship the Lord in the Beauty of Holiness.

N. With all my Heart, if you are stedfastly attached (as

I am) to the Church of England, so reformed and established, as I have before defined it.

C. G. I know not why you should doubt of that, since no man in the parish is more constant at our Parish Church. . . . And the Vicar of our Parish is as eminent and exemplary, in all the requisites of his sacred office as any in the Diocese.

Then follow the usual arguments on both sides, which need not be repeated.

As to the services held at the Nonjuring chapels, it goes without saying that they were strictly in accordance with the order of the Church of England, the names of the Sovereign and Royal Family prayed for being omitted. The writer of a squib entitled 'A Jacobite Conventicle' (1692) describes how he dogged the steps of a 'moody Jacobite' to the place of rendezvous, and then proceeds:

> But hold—Before to Fetter Lane I go
> 'Tis requisite the entrance word I know;
> Last Sunday 'twas commandèment the fifth,
> And now St. Germains is the Shibboleth.
> 'Tis so,—and now with eager steps I fly
> To the true Church of England's ministry
> To hear a sort of men who ever knew
> Still to be faithful, loyal, firm and true,
> Who for their souls detest the swearing vice,
> Either to get or keep a benefice.
> . . . . . .
> I sate me down upon a hassock,
> Expecting clergyman in cassock, &c. &c.

Before the clergyman comes all talk politics. The room is crowded with both men and women, all of whom are sullen and discontented. At last the clergyman arrives, and then:

> His surplice on, they then prepare
> To joyn with him in Common Prayer;
> Nor Psalms nor prayers did he omit any,
> Till coming to that place i' th' Litany,

Wherein obliged by name to pray
For those who bear the Sovereign sway,
He did in 's prayer no name put in,
But those of gracious King and Queen;
Which prayer, no sooner did it reach the
Ears of them all, but 'We beseech Thee'
Echoed more loud by persons there
Than the response to any prayer
Which in the Liturgy we read
From the Lord's Prayer to Nicene Creed.

The clergyman takes for his text Romans xiii. 1, 2, and the sermon is described—or imagined. In the middle of it the meeting is interrupted by a constable and party of musketeers, who drag them all before the magistrates. The oath is tendered and refused, and everyone has to pay a fine of forty shillings. It is impossible to say whether this is a real or an imaginary scene; it is probably an exaggerated account of what actually took place, and the catastrophe is exactly what happened some years later in the Goodman's Fields Chapel, under Dr. Welton, except that the punishment in the real case was more severe.

One occasional service in the Nonjuring chapels, which from the nature of the case could not find a counterpart in the Established Church, was the admission of a Penitent—that is, one who had taken the oaths, and, now repenting, desired to be admitted into the fold. 'A Form of Recantation' was drawn up by Mr. Kettlewell, in which the Penitent humbles himself to the very dust, and is then received with the most solemn injunctions. The whole service is of great length; it will be found in full in Appendix XIX. of Kettlewell's 'Compleat Works and Life.' Another Form for 'Renunciation of y^e^ Schism made by y^e^ Revolution Church,' dated December 15, 1716, followed by 'The Manner of Conferming their Orders who were ordained in Schism,' dated March 20, 1716–7,

is among the Kenyon MSS. at Gredington. In the Nonjuring Prayer Book of 1718 (to be noticed in the next section), there is a 'Form of Admission of a Penitent,' and in 1746 Dr. Deacon put forth a 'Form of Admitting a Convert into the Communion of the Church,' which it is to be feared was not much used, for the Nonjurors after 1746 dwindled rapidly away.

Passing from London to the country we find Nonjuring assemblies very sparse and irregular. They were either held in the private chapel of some nobleman or gentleman who was favourable to the cause, and, being privileged to keep a chaplain, was glad to avail himself of the services of some Nonjuring priest; this, as we have seen, was done at Longleat, at Shottesbrooke, at Burghley, at Eastwell, at Vale Royal, and other places which might be mentioned, or else they arose from the enterprise of some individual clergyman; Thomas Brett at Spring Grove is one instance, and the following is a still more interesting one, which is found among the Rawlinson MSS. in the doctor's unpublished continuation of Wood's 'Athenæ Oxonienses.'

Moses Soame (or Some) was a graduate of Christ's College, Cambridge, and became rector of Broughton, near Kettering, 'of which benefice he had the advowson, which he sold on the change of Government at the Revolution and then resigned, his conscience not permitting him to take the new oaths.' He retired to the hamlet of Little Calworth, in Hunts, where he had an estate of his own, and there 'he built a small chapel, resolving to dedicate the remainder of his days to the service of God in this place, in which chapel he performed the daily offices of Morning and Evening Prayer for many years together for all the remaining part of his life. He also therein, both morning and evening, every day throughout the year, administered the Holy Communion to his family,

and to as many others of the neighbourhood as would come to partake of it—the cup in alder wine, which answered the purpose as he thought, since his circumstances would not allow him to purchase other wine for such constant use.'

At the chief centres, outside London, of the Nonjurors we have rather vague and scattered notices of some sort of provision made for their common worship. Hearne writes with provoking vagueness in 1705: 'It seems the Non-Jurors in Oxford receive the Sacrament at Mr. Sheldon's chamber at X^t^ Church, who finds all the necessaries for it.'[1]

About Cambridge we have a much more distinct notice in the Diary of Abraham de la Pryme, the antiquary, of St. John's College, who writes:

> 1695, Oct. 3.—The Jacobites set up separate meetings all over, when there was any number of them, at which meetings I myself have once or twice been in Cambridge, for we had about 20 fellows in our College that were Nonjurors. The service they used was the Common Prayer, and always prayed heartily for King James, naming him most commonly; but in some meetings, they only prayed for the King, not naming who. . . . Their meetings in Cambridge were oftentimes broken up by order of the Vice-Chancellor.

Thomas Baker's remark to Hearne several years later, that he continued to worship at the Established Church and did not understand 'this new communion,'[2] seems possibly to imply that provision was made for the worship of 'the new communion' at Cambridge; and the late Mr. Potts, of 'Euclid' fame, told me himself that he distinctly remembered when he was young a place being pointed out to him at Cambridge where the Nonjurors used to worship. As Mr. Potts was born in 1805, the

[1] *Reliquiæ Hearnianæ*, i. 32. [2] *Collections*, i. 44.

traditions of a Nonjuring chapel may well have lingered on until the time of his youth.

At Bristol a certain Mr. Bisse (his name occurs in no list of Nonjurors) is said to have been arrested for preaching to a Jacobite congregation in 1718; but 'the congregation rescued their pastor.'[1] The West of England was the last part in which Jacobitism lingered, so the story is highly probable; but I doubt whether it means a Nonjuring chapel proper, which was not necessarily the same thing as a Jacobite meeting. At, or near Ashbourne, there was a service regularly conducted by Thomas Bedford, son of Hilkiah. At Manchester, which became a great stronghold of Jacobitism, there were for the later Nonjurors two chapels, one in Fennell Street, served by the well-known Dr. Deacon, and one called Trinity Chapel, served by the 'Oxford Methodist,' Mr. Clayton, which was virtually, if not nominally, a Nonjuring place of worship; and (*horresco referens!*) the Collegiate Church itself, then called 'the Old Church,' had, to say the least of it, strong Jacobite and Nonjuring sympathies. Later still there was a Nonjuring chapel at Shrewsbury, served by Dr. Cartwright, Dr. Deacon's son-in-law. These will come before us again in connection with the later Nonjurors. But before that time a lamentable division occurred in connection with the Nonjuring services. During the first quarter of a century, speaking roughly, there was practically a unanimity in the little community on this point. Then the apple of discord was thrown in their midst in the shape of what was technically called

THE USAGES CONTROVERSY.

It is difficult to help connecting the outbreak of this dispute with the death of Dr. Hickes. Hickes died on

[1] *London in the Jacobite Times*, i. 319.

December 15, 1715, and left no one behind him who could quite fill his place as the universally recognised head of the community. His natural successor as metropolitan, so to speak, of the Nonjurors was Jeremy Collier, who, in the larger world, at any rate, was even better known by his writings than Hickes himself; and it was more than once hinted by his opponents that it was Collier's ambition to hold this place which originated the unhappy controversy. If this were so, Collier was assuredly 'hoist with his own petard'; for it was this very controversy, more than anything else, which debarred him from assuming the mantle which Hickes had dropped, and which should naturally have fallen upon him. But there is no evidence to show that Collier was actuated by any such motive in taking the leading part he did in the matter; and, on the other hand, there is quite sufficient reason to account for his conduct, without uncharitably assigning to him the baser motive of personal ambition.

In fact, the outbreak of the controversy, deplorable though it was, was the most natural thing in the world to happen. The Nonjurors assigned the very highest importance to the Holy Eucharist as the central act of Christian worship. Not only so; they insisted strongly on its sacrificial character. Everything that could elevate the Holy Sacrament and bring out prominently its sacrificial aspect would be likely to find acceptance with them. Well, but was there not an office which some of the holiest and most competent Churchmen of the day, men like Archbishop Sharp, Bishop Wilson, of Sodor and Man, John Johnson of Cranbrook, Joseph Bingham, none of whom were Nonjurors, would fain have seen restored in place of the one in established use—a service for which their late venerable father, Dr. Hickes, had

expressed his preference, had printed in an Appendix to his 'Christian Priesthood,' and had actually used in his oratory in Scroop's Court? It would have been strange indeed if the Nonjurors, who were naturally drawn to liturgical study, who were unfettered by State trammels, who were tied neither by duty nor by gratitude to 'the Establishment,' which had been but a harsh stepmother to them, had not thought of that First Prayer Book of King Edward VI., which certainly met their wants better than the one in use. And so the question arose, not from the private ambition of any individual, but from the nature of the case.

Before entering into the history it may be premised that the 'Usages' were these four:

(1) The mixed chalice.

(2) Prayers for the faithful departed.

(3) Prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost on the consecrated elements.

(4) The Oblatory Prayer, offering the elements to the Father as symbols of His Son's Body and Blood.

These four points are all covered by King Edward's First Prayer Book: wherein (1) the rubric orders the putting a little pure and clean water to the wine in the chalice; (2) instead of 'Let us pray for Christ's Church militant here in earth,' the invitation is 'Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church,' the later words being added for obvious reasons; and in the prayer itself there is a long and beautiful clause commending to God's mercy those 'which are departed hence from us with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace;' and (3) and (4) are both distinctly covered by two clauses in the Consecration Prayer which were expunged from the second and subsequent Books. It was not, however, exactly the First Prayer Book of Edward VI.

which the Usagers made their form of worship, as we shall see presently.

The uprise of the controversy has been described vividly by two hands, one that of a Non-Usager, the other that of a Usager; so by the insertion of both accounts a fair view of the situation will be gained.

The first is appended to a tract entitled 'Mr. Collier's Desertion Discussed;[1] or, The Office of Worship in the Liturgy of the Church of England defended against the bold attacks of that Gentleman, late of her Communion, now of his own.' It is dated 'Worcester, December 1719,' and has been attributed variously to Blackbourne, Hawes, and Gandy. It runs as follows:

An Historical Account of the Schism.

In July, 1716 there happened in conversation some mention of Edward VI.'s first Liturgy, and Proposals for reviving it; which being several times repeated and insisted on by the Advocates of its Restoration, at length they desired that a time and place might be fixed on to deliberate farther on this affair; which was granted.

Then follows a long account of the two meetings and their chairman, who was undoubtedly Collier, though no names are given.

At the Second meeting a Paper by way of Petition for the Alterations aimed at was (to most) unexpectedly produced and read, which had been signed by some within doors, but by more without. Then [after a dispute] the alterations were proposed; which being fairly and calmly debated on both sides, and put to the vote, a great majority declared against them, and this Dr. Brett himself frankly owns. 'The majority——would not allow that an Iota or Tittle of the Office in the Common Prayer-Book should be altered' (Vindic. of P.S. Pref. p. 6).[2] Upon our standing our ground, and abiding by the resolution of the last meeting the Restorers assembled, where they were secure of

[1] This title has, of course, reference to the title of Collier's own tract, *The Desertion Discussed*, published just twenty years before.

[2] For an account of this 'Vindication' see *infra*, p. 304.

having no opposition and drew up an instrument declaring they thought it necessary to put those Primitive and Catholic Usages (as they call 'em) in Practice, Dec. 19, 1717. And the next day two of them sufficiently declar'd they would no longer join in Communion with us, by giving Injunctions for altering the Liturgy. This on Dec. 20, 1717. . . . The governing principle, humanly speaking, precludes all possibility of union, as if the most distinguished merit consisted in running as far as they could from old friends. Thus they broke off from the Communion both of the *English* and *Scotch* Church, and are in Communion of no part of the world; composed a New Office and withdrew from those who could not approve it, forbidding Communion to be held with all such. This act was their Preparation for Easter, 1718, when they defaced the beauty of holiness by their new office. The Assembly where this was enacted, consisted of 8 English and 6 Scotch clergymen, and even of that number, one who was under deliberation made no long delay to declare for the Church of England; another like the Scapegoat, was sent packing into the Wilderness of Popery; and a third, if of any communion, has wandered into the same broad way.

In the last fatal interview the Chief[1] opened the causes of the assembly, viz.: the unsuccessfulness of the Proposals and the necessity of the things debated, upon which (he said) a Separation became unavoidable; and then he recommended to them the New Communion Office which was read distinctly, and in most things approv'd by those present.

Thus far the Non-Usager. Now let us see what the Usager says about the same matter. As to the authorship of this account there is no doubt, for it occurs in Brett's extremely valuable 'Collection of Liturgies' (1720), printed with his name attached, and the writer begins with his own personal experience:

When I had quitted the public Communion and joined myself to the Communion of Bishop Hickes, . . . I conceived I had authority, or at least his leave to do those things which he had so much recommended in his public writings. I from that time, when I did administer the Eucharist, always mixed

[1] Collier.

water with the wine; I left out the words 'militant in earth,' and I said the Prayer of Oblation and Invocation aloud. Other persons who were sensible of these defects in the established Communion Office endeavoured to supply them in such a manner as they thought most expedient, some one way, some another, which broke our Uniformity. This being observed by some among us, some months after the death of Bishop Hickes, they thought it advisable to lay the case before their superiors and to desire their direction on these points, that the Uniformity might not be broken. Hereupon the Bishops and several Presbyters met to consult what was to be done in this matter; but the Major part declared, that as there was a Liturgy established, the way to preserve Uniformity was to stick close to that, and they had no authority to recede one tittle from it: That as to the matters proposed concerning mixing water with the Sacramental Wine, praying for the departed, making an Oblation of the Elements, and Invoking the Descent of the Holy Ghost to bless and sanctify the Bread and Cup, some said they were indeed *desideranda*; however it was not seasonable to introduce them at this Time, and others seemed not to approve of them at any Time. But as there were some there of both Orders who thought these things to be essentially necessary to the Eucharist, they very much pressed, that as there was an English Liturgy made in the 2nd and 3rd years of King Edward VI. which contained all that was now desired, the Communion might be administered among us according to that Office; or at least some of the Prayers and Directions in that Communion Office might be added to the present Office. But the Majority still insisted that they were obliged to adhere to the present Liturgy, and could make no alterations in it. [Hence the Schism.]

The controversy begins moderately, but, as is the way of controversies, *vires acquirit eundo*. 'Reasons for Restoring some Prayers and Directions as they stood in the First English Reformed Liturgy' was the first contribution; it appeared in 1717, and created such a sensation that it reached a fourth edition in 1718. The writer was Jeremy Collier, and it is written temperately, and, needless to add, very ably. He specifies the Four

Points, shows how they are all contained in the First Prayer Book, affirms that he 'goes on the ground that the Holy Eucharist is a proper Sacrifice,' fortifies his position by citations from the Primitive Fathers and Apostolical Constitutions, and quotes the statute which says of the first Prayer Book, ''twas finished by the aid of the Holy Ghost.' He was immediately answered in a pamphlet, 'No Reason for restoring the Prayers and Directions of Edward VI.'s First Liturgy,' by a Nonjuror (1717), the 'Nonjuror' being Nathanael Spinckes. This, too, was ably written; but the writer does not know so much about his subject as Collier, and in more than one point lays himself open to a crushing retort. For instance, he expresses some doubt as to what Justin Martyr means by the κρᾶμα, or Mixture, and objects that it is mentioned by no one before Justin Martyr; he declares that Tertullian was the first Christian who mentions Prayers for the Dead, and hints that he probably 'received it with his Montanism,' adding that 'we hear nothing about it out of Afric for 100 years after him,' that it is 'built wholly on Tradition,' and that 'S. Cyprian is the only authority for it in the third century.'

Collier was not the man to let such slips pass. There quickly appeared 'A Defence of the Reasons,' &c. (1718), in which he asks very pertinently, Is not Justin Martyr the first Father who gives an account of the Christian worship? defends successfully the argument from tradition by the analogy of Sunday, and asserts sweepingly, but giving strong grounds for his assertion, that 'the Tradition for the mixt cup was early, general, and uninterrupted.' Spinckes quickly replied in a pamphlet entitled 'No sufficient Reason for restoring some Prayers and Directions of King Edward VI.'s First Liturgy' (1718). The insertion of the qualifying epithet 'suffi-

cient' may perhaps indicate that the writer felt he had gone too far in his former work.

Others rushed into the fray; but Collier and Spinckes were regarded as the leaders of the Usagers and Non-Usagers respectively, and for various reasons they were the proper persons to be so; but they were not, in my opinion, the best and most effective writers on either side on this particular subject. The best defender of the Usagers with his pen was Thomas Brett, because he knew more about liturgical matters than any who took part in the dispute. The best defender of the Non-Usagers was Charles Leslie, not because, like Brett, he had made liturgiology his special study, but because his plain common sense, his logical mind, and his forcible, incisive style enabled him to point out the real weakness of the Usagers' position more clearly than anyone else.

Dr. Brett entered the lists in his valuable little work entitled 'Tradition necessary to Explain and Interpret Holy Scripture' (1718). It deals towards the close with Spinckes' 'No Reason,' &c., but after the sheets were sent to the press Spinckes' second pamphlet 'No Sufficient Reason,' &c., had appeared, so Brett adds a postscript dealing with 'the learned Gentleman's little Treatise,' of which he evidently has not a very high opinion. With the utmost courtesy he points out clearly how the proper use of tradition bears upon the matter in hand, showing, among other things, that the Mixture was sanctioned by the example of Christ, who at the institution of the Holy Eucharist obviously used the Paschal Cup, which, as a plain matter of history, contained wine with a mixture of water.

If it had been an abstract question of ecclesiastical history and primitive use, the Usagers could probably have proved their point, particularly as there was no one

on the other side who knew the subject so well as Brett, or who could write so effectively as Collier. But Charles Leslie saw that that was *not* the real question. He was in exile, but a report reached him about the controversy in his distant home; indeed, his advice was formally asked on the points at issue, and he became a most valuable ally of the Non-Usagers, not so much from his knowledge of the subject as from the plain, common-sense view which he took of it. He wrote (1) 'A Letter from Mr. Leslie to his Friends against Alterations or Additions to the Liturgy of the Church of England' (1718); (2) 'A Letter from the Rev. Mr. Charles Leslie concerning the New Separation to Mr. B——' [probably Mr. Bowyer] (1719). In the first he seems to me rather to give himself away by unduly depreciating the value of tradition. It immediately brought out an ironical reply, entitled 'An Answer to a Printed Letter said to be written by Mr. Lesley.' The writer professes to think that Leslie could not really have written the letter; for he would never, with his principles, have decried tradition, or 'put the tradition of the Elders on a level with the Tradition of the Illuminated Fathers of the Christian Church,' or have not known that we believe the Holy Scriptures themselves from tradition. 'Mr. Leslie,' he adds, 'knows very well that the Standard of our English Reformation is Primitive Doctrine, Discipline, Worship, and Government, and that we have not yet come up to our Standard, and therefore ought by all means to get it as soon as we can.' Accordingly, he suggests that 'some of those Sectarians or Heretics whom God enabled Mr. L. to confute forged this letter in his name.' The 'Answer' is, from the writer's point of view (which, one might have imagined, would be Mr. Leslie's view also), unanswerable; it is extremely able, and one cannot help fancying that

Collier's hand had been at work, though there is no evidence that it had. But in his next 'Letter' Mr. Leslie hits the real blot, and with his usual acumen turns the tables against the Usagers. Mr. B—— was a Usager, and Leslie begins most pertinently: 'That I may not go upon misinformations . . . . who made this separation? Did they separate from you because you put water in your wine? or did you separate from them because they did not?' This seems to me to be the whole gist of the question, which was not whether the Usages were primitive or not, but (1) whether they were *essential*; (2) if not, whether it was expedient to insist upon them at the risk of dividing an already small and diminishing body; and (3) whether the whole Church of England since the Reformation had been in schism for want of them. Upon these points Leslie insists with remorseless logic, and he was not at all adequately answered. In one reply it was rather weakly urged, 'Notwithstanding our Persuasion that none of these Primitive Usages can be dispensed with, yet we do not insist on their being received by our Brethren as necessary things; provided they officiate by them, they may, if they please, declare their compliance means no more than Temporary Concessions and Expedients for Union.'[1] As if the Non-Usagers could be content with a compromise which really meant that they should do one thing and think another! Another answer is a long pamphlet, probably by Roger Laurence, in which the writer adopts the same ironical strain, but with less force, which had been previously adopted—namely, that 'some one or other has presumed to burlesque his [Mr. Leslie's] orthodoxy in printing Letters from him which none that know him are willing to believe were

[1] 'Answer to a Letter from the Rev. Charles Leslie concerning what he calls the New Separation' (1719).

ever the productions of his pen.'[1] But neither of these, nor any of the other answers, deals adequately with the main point, which was not whether the Usages were primitive, nor whether they were desirable in themselves, but whether they were *essential*. The Usagers contended that they *were*, and hence were called *Essentialists*. Now this would mean that the whole Church of England, a great number—perhaps the majority—of the Nonjurors themselves, the whole Church of Rome (which, though sanctioning such usages, did not regard them as *essential*), and of course all other religious communities were unchurched, and that the Church in Europe consisted of a small fragment which had only just come into existence! Or, as Mr. Leslie put it, their contention obliged them

> to refuse Communion with all other Churches (which were all in the nation) who celebrated the Communion according to the established liturgy of the National Church, to disown the Liturgy to which they themselves have given their unfeigned assent and consent, and which has been established by all authority, spiritual and temporal, in the nation, and never to use it more, especially by no means the Communion Service; and that we have had no true Sacrament (except at Barking) since the Reformation.[2]

This is strongly but not unfairly put, and an answer to it was not forthcoming. The reference to Barking alludes to the plea urged that Dr. Hickes had used the mixed chalice when he was vicar of Allhallows Barking. Another writer—probably Spinckes—puts the matter in rather a different form, but quite as pertinently: 'I earnestly beg of our old Friends and Brethren, who have so unhappily withdrawn from us, that they will remember we continue

[1] *Mr. Leslie's Defence from some Erroneous and Dangerous Principles Advanced in a Letter, said to have been written by him, concerning the New Separation*, by a known Friend of Mr. Leslie (1719).

[2] Leslie's *Letter to Mr. B.*

still the same as we were, and that when we were united it was upon our Principles, not theirs.'[1] In short, it seems to me that, while the Usagers had the best of the argument in detail, Brett and Collier really knowing most about the subject, they put themselves hopelessly in the wrong by insisting upon the necessity of what was not really necessary, and what was being introduced at a singularly inopportune time. As '*Usagers*' they were right; as '*Essentialists*' they were wrong.

While this controversy was going on the New Communion Office appeared under the title of 'A Communion Office, taken partly from Primitive Liturgies and partly from the First English Reformed Common Prayer Book, Together with Offices for Confirmation and the Visitation of the Sick.' The Communion Office did not differ much from the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. except in one important particular. The 'Prayer for the Descent of the Holy Ghost on the Consecrated Elements' (Ἐπίκλησις), which, it will be remembered, was the third of the 'Four Points,' recognises the Objective Presence more distinctly than the corresponding prayer in King Edward's Book. In the latter the invocation is:—'Vouchsafe so to bless and sanctify with Thy Word and Holy Spirit these Thy gifts of bread and wine, *that they may be unto us* the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son'; in the office of 1718, instead of '*that they may be unto us*,' the words are '*that they may become*'; also in King Edward's Book the invocation comes *before* the words of institution, in the Nonjurors' Book *after* the words of institution; and the 'Prayer for the whole Estate of Christ's Church' is placed after instead of before the Prayer of Consecration: 'For when the Sacrifice

[1] Preface to *No Just Grounds for the Introducing the New Communion Office, &c.*, by a Nonjuror (1719).

commemorative of that upon the Cross is finished, is the most proper time to declare the ends of the Oblation, and to recommend the Church to the Divine Protection.' So writes the author of the Preface, who also tells us that

> at the placing of the Elements on the Altar, there is a Prayer for Acceptance abridged out of S. Basil's Liturgy; the Recital of signal instances of Divine Providence as introductive to the Words of Institution paraphrased from S. James' Liturgy, and the Prayer of Oblation and Invocation, from the Apostolical Constitutions; that the Cross and the Chrism were restored in the Confirmation, the Cross being used in the first Reformed Liturgy, and the Chrism being primitive; and that the Anointing with Oil in the Office was primitive, being commended by S. James; and that it was not by way of Extreme Unction, but in order to recovery.

It is an interesting question, 'Who wróte this Preface?' because it is all but certain that whoever wrote it had the main hand in drawing up the Office. It is curious to observe how many different theories there are about the composition. Some attribute it to Deacon, which is absurd on the face of it, as Deacon was then under twenty years of age; others to Collier; others to George Smith of Durham (afterwards a Nonjuring bishop), under the direction of Brett; others think that three Scotchmen, Campbell, Gadderar, and Rattray, had much to do with it. Of these the two most noted as liturgical scholars were Brett and Rattray; and as Rattray was certainly in London and in close connection with the English Nonjurors about the time when the new Office was being compiled, he would naturally be consulted on the matter, and his opinion would have great weight; Collier also would, of course, have his say, for he was the *primum mobile* of the whole affair, and nothing would be done without his approval; but, though it is mainly conjecture, it seems to me that Brett must have been the chief

compiler of the book, and also the writer of the Preface; the internal evidence of style and matter points in this direction. Indeed, in a 'Vindication,' &c.,[1] which will come before us directly, he all but admits it. Speaking of the 'Four Points,' which he calls 'essential Points and necessary to Salvation' (!) he adds:

> I believed them to be *desideranda* only, for a considerable time before I could persuade myself they were any of them *essential. I examined them before the framing* [the italics are mine] and enjoining a *New Communion Office*, and I have in my discourse upon the Liturgies given my Reasons at large why I believe all these to be *Essential* Points.

But this is anticipating. Let us go back to the time of the first use of the New Prayer Book, that is, Easter 1719. Before the year was over it was assailed in various pamphlets, the most important of which was one entitled 'No Just Grounds for introducing the New Communion Office, or Denying Communion to those who cannot think themselves at liberty to reject the Liturgy of the Church of England for its sake. By a Nonjuror' (1719). 'A Nonjuror' was undoubtedly Nathanael Spinckes, and the work was specially intended as an answer to Dr. Brett, with whom, as we have seen,[2] he had already crossed swords. In the Preface he complains:

> Our zealous restorers have thought fit to change the scene, and to drop King Edward VI.'s Liturgy in behalf of which they had set out with a great deal of warmth and to compile another of their own; whence they have expunged the Decalogue, pray that the Bread in the Eucharist *may be made* our Saviour's Body and the Cup his Blood, and added two new Offices for Unction, one in Confirmation, one upon the sick bed.

In the body of the work he deals with the question of Scripture and tradition, and discusses the evidence of the

[1] See *infra*, p. 304. [2] See *supra*, p. 297.

Fathers, the whole being directed against Brett's treatise on Tradition, especially its Postscript and Appendix. It will be observed that in the sentence quoted from the Preface the writer makes a strange slip, implying that the expunging of the Decalogue was an innovation of the New Communion Office.[1] Of course Dr. Brett was up in arms at once, and in 1720 published the work already quoted, 'A Vindication of the Postscript to a Book called "The necessary Use of Tradition to understand the Holy Scriptures," in answer to a Book entitled "No Just Grounds for Introducing the New Communion Office, &c." By Thomas Brett, LL.D.' It is a curious instance of the veneration in which Dr. Hickes's memory was held that in the Preface he shelters himself under that great man's writings, though Brett himself was probably the better liturgical scholar of the two. His 'Vindication' is in one sense quite unanswerable. He contends that the 'Four Points' were restored, not because they were in the First Liturgy of Edward VI., but because they had been in all the liturgies of the Church from the Apostles' days to the Reformation Act. 'The New Communion Office' (as it was called) contained nothing but what was much older than the present Communion Office of the Church of England where it differed from it. He points out courteously, but plainly, his opponent's slip, reminding him that 'the Decalogue is not in the Communion Office of K. Edward's First Liturgy, nor in any office that is not of a later date'; and that '*Make* the Bread the Body of Christ and the Cup the Blood,' instead of '*that they may be unto us*,' is in *all* the liturgies used in any Church before the Reformation, excepting the Roman Canon.

[1] Of course the words may only mean that the Decalogue which stands in the established Office is expunged in the New Office; but surely this should have been expressed more clearly.

Collier also published some very strong tracts in 1719 and 1720, dealing mainly with another point which was distinctly *ad rem*. Having spoken of the action of 'Calvin and Knox and some others of their principles,' he adds in his strain of polished sarcasm:

> These were the men that laid aside the Mixture; that declar'd against Prayer for the Dead; that allowed no Eucharistick Sacrifice, nor any Oblatory Prayer which might carry to that sense. Were I worthy to recommend to these gentlemen Nonjurors, I should rather suggest a Preference for Justin Martyr and Irenæus &c., those Primitive, non-resisting Fathers, than resign to the novelties of the 16th century and be governed by the tenents of those men who in several countries turned the World upside down, and pressed their Reformation with Fire and Sword.[1]

And in a later tract (1720) he points out, certainly with great force and truth, as Hooker pointed out before him, that it was 'the Dissenter's, not the Churchman's, position to require in points of worship an explicit warrant from Scripture, an undisputed Text, to almost a Calvinistical excess.' Those, he says, were 'not enemies to the Church of England who would revive the main of her first Reformation, when all her Managers were English, when she was neither embarrass'd with Novelists abroad, nor overset with the Regale at home.'[2]

At first the weight of defending the Usages and the New Office which incorporated them seems to have fallen almost entirely upon Collier and Brett, who were, however, quite strong enough to bear it. Their chief allies were two very young men, Thomas Deacon and Thomas Wagstaffe, the younger. The former published in 1718 a singularly able pamphlet, considering his age, on 'The

[1] *A Vindication of the 'Reasons,' &c., and 'Defence,' &c., by the Author of them*, part ii., 1719.

[2] *A Further Defence, &c., by the Author of the 'Reasons,' &c.*, 1720.

Doctrine of Rome concerning Purgatory,' showing that it differed *in toto* from the Usagers' doctrine when they advocated prayers for the dead, and prefixing a most modest Dedication to Dr. Brett, which shows that he (Deacon) hardly deserved to be twitted, as he was, with his youthful presumption. Wagstaffe published in 1719 a Defence of the Mixed Chalice in excellent Latin, but these only dealt with single points in the controversy, and neither of the writers had come to his full maturity.

On the other side the Non-Usagers had many well-known names among their writers. Spinckes and Leslie have already been noticed. Matthias Earbery wrote vehemently, not to say violently, on the same side; William Snatt, who had been associated with Collier in the absolution of Sir John Perkins, also rushed into the fray on the opposite side to Collier; so did John Blackbourne, who was a very prominent man in the party and an uncompromising Non-Usager to the last; and so did Henry Gandy, whose writings are the most able and effective of all against the Usages, at any rate after those of Spinckes.

But in spite of the numerical superiority of the Non-Usagers and the greater bulk of their writings the New Office made its way; and after fourteen years, during which the two sections of the Nonjurors were entirely separated, each section consecrating bishops and ordaining clergy for its own body, the two united again on the Usagers' terms about 1731, in which year Timothy Mawman was consecrated by three bishops, two of whom were Usagers and one a Non-Usager.

The triumph of the Usagers was not surprising when one looks into the matter. Controversial writings, like votes, must be weighed as well as counted, and Collier's and Brett's outweighed all on the other side, which

did not improve its chances by being too often wildly extravagant and very personal. Such expressions as 'Tradition, that dear Idol which they have worshipped, as some do the devil, only to be left in the lurch,' 'a few ridiculous Liturgies' (that is, the Clementine, St. James's, St. Basil's, &c.!), 'the Apostolick Constitutions, the spurious offspring of a weak, hot-headed Impostor,'[1] 'that gentleman [Collier] late of her Communion [the Church of England], now of his own,'[2] 'I see two things very ill coupled, Boy and Confidence' [in allusion to Deacon's youthfulness],[3] really did more harm to the writers' own side than to that of their adversaries. Leslie's powerful pen could do nothing more for the Non-Usagers after his 'Letter to Mr. B.,' which was his last production. The death of Spinckes in 1727 removed the man who, not only by his learning and abilities, but by his saintly character and reputation, was their most influential supporter. The younger Nonjurors also who were coming to the front were Usagers. Thomas Deacon was gaining age and experience, and could no longer be reproached with his youth and presumption; Thomas Wagstaffe, the younger, proved himself quite as able a man as his father, if not more so; Thomas Brett, the younger, took exactly the same line as Thomas Brett, the elder, and from 1727 father and son were bishops together; the two Scottish bishops, Campbell and Gadderar, who were most closely associated with the English Nonjurors, were strong 'Usagers.' What may seem strange, however, the exiled Wanderer, whom both parties alike recognised as their lawful king, sympathised with the Non-Usagers. As he was himself a Roman Catholic it

[1] *Reflections upon Modern Fanaticism*, by M. E. (Matthias Earbery).

[2] *Mr. Collier's 'Desertion Discussed.'*

[3] *A Dialogue in Vindication of our Present Liturgy and Service: between Timothy a Churchman, and Thomas an Essentialist.*

might have been expected that he would side with those who were supposed to approach nearest to Rome, and were, indeed, charged, both by Non-Usagers and Compliers, with a tendency to popery. But this was probably one reason why the Chevalier took the other side; he was anxious to conciliate his Protestant subjects, and knowing what Rome was, he was perfectly well aware that the Usagers were in reality not one step nearer her than the Non-Usagers; from a theological point of view there was nothing to choose between them, while from a political, advantages might be derived from his taking the Non-Usagers' side. But the Nonjurors had quite sense enough to see that in such a matter the Chevalier's views were worth just nothing at all. The New Offices were by degrees generally accepted, and by 1733 there was only one bishop, John Blackbourne, and a very few priests who ministered according to the established liturgy. But there was no real and permanent union; fresh causes of dispute soon arose and fresh divisions took place. 'The beginning of strife is as when one letteth out water,' and the spirit of discord once introduced was never healed.

+ p. 321

CHAPTER VII

THE LATER NONJURORS

INTERNAL dissensions contributed largely to the decline of the Nonjuring cause; but in justice to the later Nonjurors it should be added that there were other reasons for which they can hardly be regarded as responsible. In the first place, time was against them. As year after year elapsed, the memory of the invalidly deprived Fathers, who had sacrificed eminence for obscurity, affluence for penury, in the cause of consistency, of loyalty, and of resistance to the encroachments of the State upon the spiritual independence of the Church, grew fainter and fainter. The rising generation had been brought up from their infancy in the new state of things, and knew no other.[1]

Men were in no mood to tolerate in the Church any more than in the State another revolution, which must have happened before the Nonjurors could have their way. It is true that, after the establishment of the House of Hanover a temporary reaction set in. Some of the warmest friends of the Protestant Succession had been bitterly disappointed; when that Succession became an established fact it did not bring in the halcyon period which they had fondly expected; and it became so unpopular among the unthinking populace as to raise riots which verged perilously near to another revolution.

[1] This point, so far as politics were concerned, is brought out with his usual clearness and raciness by Dean Swift, in *An Inquiry into the Behaviour of the Queen's* [Anne] *last Ministry*, and in *Free Thoughts on the present State of Affairs* (1714).

But, oddly enough, this very discontent, which might have been expected to be favourable to the Nonjurors, was in reality one of the most potent causes of their downfall. The Hanoverian dynasty was so unpopular that the return of the Stuarts was *anticipated*; but it was anticipated not with satisfaction, but with the utmost alarm, not to say panic; and the Nonjurors, in conjunction with the papists, were regarded as *fons et origo mali*. So no language was bad enough for them. Lord Chesterfield spoke of them as 'the malicious and contemptible sect of the Nonjurors'; when the Nonjuring chapel in Spitalfields was opened in 1716, the *Weekly Journal* hoped that 'all persons loyally affected to King George will timely suppress the diabolical society, as they have done the like seditious assemblies of blind, deluded fools in the Savoy, Scroope's Court in Holborn, and in Aldersgate Street'; another writer mildly remarked: 'Jacobites and Nonjurors are but a race of British Hottentots, as blind and bigotted as their brethren about the Cape, but more savage in their manners.' It was thought no hardship to tax them double; in 1722 it was proposed and carried in Parliament to raise 100,000*l.* on the estates of Nonjurors and papists; and a Nonjuring clergyman was thought to have been far too leniently treated when he was put in the pillory, fined, and imprisoned for three years, for being concerned in the publication of a book which had been stamped with the full approval of the saintly Robert Nelson; while another had his gown stripped off his back by the common hangman. This violent antagonism, added to the negative disadvantage of being entirely shut out from all public employments, undoubtedly contributed to the gradual dwindling away of the Nonjuring body.

But in that body there were still men of transcendent

ability and piety, as the following sketches of individuals will, it is hoped, show.

The bishops must, of course, come first. The principles of the Nonjurors led them to attach so great importance to the episcopate that it would be quite out of harmony with their spirit to give their bishops any but the first place; but it is fair to add that some who did not attain episcopal rank were far more eminent than some who did. In fact, several of the later bishops will require only a very brief notice.

The first two who were consecrated after the Usages controversy arose were Hilkiah Bedford and Ralph Taylor. The consecration took place on St. Paul's Day (January 25), 1720–1, in the chapel at Gray's Inn, of which Dr. Richard Rawlinson was the minister. The consecrators were Bishops Spinckes, Hawes, and Gandy, all Non-Usagers. Neither of the two lived to enjoy his new honours long, Bedford dying in 1724, and Taylor in 1722; and neither of them took any prominent part in Nonjuring affairs after his consecration. Bedford's life-work was done before he reached the episcopate, and therefore his career has been traced in connection with the earlier Nonjurors.[1] He was not an old man in years when he became a bishop, but one can well understand that his troubled life, with his three years' imprisonment, would make him old before his time, and that he would be glad of rest. Ralph Taylor *was* an old man at the time of his consecration; having taken his B.A. degree at Trinity College, Oxford, in 1670, he must have been at least seventy. He had been rector of Stoke Severn for some years before the Revolution, when he refused to take the oaths and was deprived in 1690. Like many Nonjurors he went abroad, joining his lost sovereign. He

[1] See *supra*, pp. 198–203.

was for some time chaplain to the English Churchmen at the Court of St. Germains. There he came into contact with Denis Granville, the deprived Dean of Durham; and when Dean Granville died at Paris, in 1703, Dr. Taylor officiated at his funeral. The only use he appears to have made of his very brief episcopate was to perform an act which he had much better have left undone. He was induced to consecrate two bishops, by his sole authority, and without the assistance or approval of the regular Nonjurors, and thus commenced a short-lived irregular succession, as will be duly described in a future page. This was in 1722, and he died in December the same year.

The Usagers quickly followed with a consecration on their side; but they were reduced to such straits that Collier and Brett were obliged to call in the aid of a Scotch bishop, Archibald Campbell, and on November 25, 1722, the three joined in consecrating John Griffin to the episcopate.

John Griffin (1680–1731) was born at Towcester, in Northants, where his father was a surgeon. He was educated at the neighbouring grammar school of Green's Norton, and proceeded thence to Merton College, Oxford, in 1696. He was ordained deacon in 1702, priest in 1704, was curate of Compton in Kent for about two years, and then settled at Sarsden, near Chipping Norton, where he was curate to a Mr. Vernon; and in 1709 he was also made lecturer of Churchill, within half a mile of Sarsden. In 1715 he refused the oaths, quitted both posts, and became chaplain to Lord Plymouth. He went in 1728 'to take care of the congregation at Newcastle-upon-Tyne,' being at that time a bishop; and among the ordinations recorded in the Rawlinson MSS. we find 'William Fothergill ordained Deacon at Newcastle-upon-Tyne by

Mr. John Griffin.' In 1730 'he was obliged to remove for his health's sake,' so he returned to Sarsden and remained there, 'at the seat of Sir David Walter, Bart.,' until his death, July 8, 1731. He was buried in the chancel of Churchill.[1] An obituary notice in the *Daily Post*, September 25, 1731, says that 'he lived retired, was an excellent scholar, and remarkable for his singular modesty and exemplary life and conversation, which captivated the affections of all that had the happiness to know him.' When he became a bishop he joined Collier, Brett, and other Nonjuring prelates in their correspondence with the Eastern Church, and his signature 'Johannes Anglo-Britanniæ Episcopus,' appears in all the later letters.[2]

The next consecration was on the part of the Non-Usagers, and was performed by four Scotch bishops, who, unlike Campbell and Gadderar, had no particular connection with the English Nonjurors. Thinking, perhaps, that some apology was needed (as it certainly was) for acting outside their province, without the co-operation, as in other cases, of any bishop belonging to the English Nonjurors, they explained in the Apographum that they had acted because 'most of their dearest brethren and colleagues in the Episcopal College among the Britons had fallen asleep in the Lord, and the very few who survived were all but worn out by manifold cares, by diseases and by the weight of old age.'[3] The new bishop was *Henry Doughty* (1662–1730), son of Henry Doughty, rector (?) of Elton, in the diocese of Durham; he was

[1] Most of this information is derived from a letter (not published) of N. Sturges to Dr. Rawlinson, dated 'Sarsden, June 13, 1733.'

[2] See G. Williams's *The Orthodox and the Nonjurors*, p. 124 onwards, and Lathbury's *History of the Nonjurors*, p. 353.

[3] The full apographum is given in a very interesting paper, entitled 'Fragmenta Varia.—No. 1. Pope Innocent XII. and the Nonjuring Consecration,' in *The Union Review*, vol. i. January to December 1863.

educated at Durham School, and graduated at St. John's College, Cambridge (B.A. 1686, M.A. 1689), and became curate of Robin Hood's Bay, Flamborough. There are three interesting letters from him to Mr. Hope, Dean Granville's former curate at Easington, inserted in Granville's Remains; they are dated respectively 1709, 1712, and 1714, and show that the writer was in the full swim of Nonjuring life, while his correspondent was not.[1] Doughty and Hope would be known to one another through their connection with Durham.

Unlike all the rest of the Nonjuring bishops, Doughty was consecrated, not in a Nonjuring oratory in London, but at Edinburgh on March 30, 1725, by John Fullarton (Bishop of Edinburgh), Arthur Miller, William Irvine, and David Fairbairn, bishops, and the Apographum says, they 'had taken upon them the responsibility of this consecration, at the earnest request of Bps. Spinckes and Collier.' Bishop Doughty died on July 14, 1730, and his death is thus noticed in the *Grub Street Journal*, 'Wednesday, July 15. Yesterday died in the 69th year of his age the Revd. Mr. Doughty, a Nonjuring Clergyman. He was a gentleman eminently distinguished for all those good qualities, which make a man an ornament to his profession, and was deservedly loved and esteemed by all who knew him.'

The next bishop was a more notable man, 'John Blackbourne consecrated at Grey's Inne by Mr. Spinckes, Gandy and Doughty on Ascension Day, 1725 in the presence of Heneage, Earl of Winchilsea, Mr. John Creyk, Jos. Hall, Sir Thos. L'Estrange, Bart., Mr. Tho. Martyn, and Mr. Wm. Bowyer.'

John Blackbourne (1683–1741) graduated from Trinity College, Cambridge, and after refusing the Abjuration

[1] See *Remains of Denis Granville* (Surtees Soc.), ii. 251–4.

Oath of 1715, became a corrector of the press for William Bowyer, and was 'one of the most accurate of any that ever took upon him that laborious employ.'[1] But he also published literary work on his own account, culminating in an edition of the Works of Francis Bacon, an ambitious undertaking which professed to be the first complete edition ever issued in England; and, as already noted, he was probably the writer of that important pamphlet, 'Mr. Collier's "Desertion Discussed,"' and the 'Historical Account' of the rise of the Usages controversy. If so, he must have been living or staying at Worcester at the time, for that document is dated 'Worcester,' 1719. But his permanent home was London, where he officiated at the oratory in Gray's Inn, known as 'Mr. Blackbourne's Chapel.' He was the last of the Nonjuring bishops who held out against the Usages, continuing to officiate according to the use of the Established Church until his death in 1741. He took a leading part in a meeting about the Usages in 1731, which for the time prevented what may be called the surrender of the Non-Usagers. An obituary notice of Blackbourne, taken from the MSS. of Richard Bowes, D.D., is inserted in Nichols's 'Literary Anecdotes,' which, after having mentioned the facts noted, gives the following interesting anecdote:

> This good man for several years has been a Nonjuring Bishop equal to most of our bench. I waited on him often in Little Britain, where he lived almost lost to the world, and hid amongst old books. One day, before dinner, he went to his bureau and took out a paper. It was a copy of the testimonial sent to King James (as he called him), signed by his Lordship (Winchelsea) and two others (I think) in his behalf. He afterwards shewed me the commission for his consecration. Upon this I begged his blessing, which he gave me with the fervent

[1] Nichols's *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, i. 252.

zeal and devotion of a primitive Bishop. I asked him if I was so happy as to belong to his diocese? His answer was (I thought) very remarkable: 'Dear friend' (said he) 'we leave the sees open, that the gentlemen who now unjustly possess them, upon the restoration, may, if they please, return to their duty, and be continued. We content ourselves with full episcopal power as suffragans.' [1]

Blackbourne died at Islington, and was buried in Islington Churchyard, where his epitaph (a long one) describes him as 'Pontificorum æque ac Novatorum Malleus,' which implies that he wrote both against papists and Protestant Dissenters.

Another consecration on the Non-Usagers' side quickly followed that of Mr. Blackbourne. On St. Barnabas's Day (June 11), 1725, '*Mr. Henry Hall* [1672–1731] was consecrated in Mr. Blackbourne's Chapell in Grey's Inne by Rev. Mr. Spinckes, Gandy, Doughty and Blackbourne; present, Jos. Hall, John Creyke, Wm. Law, Mr. Geo. Bew, Mr. Wm. Bowyer, Tho. Martyn, and Mr. Brewster.' The new bishop was trained in Nonjuring traditions, for he was the son of Thomas Hall, rector of Castle Camps, who had refused the oaths at the Revolution; and both he and his brother, Joseph Hall, followed their father's example and became Nonjurors. As a member of St. John's College, Cambridge, he would see the Nonjuring element well represented. He died in 1731, and the following account is given of him in the *Evening Post*:

Nov. 25, 1731 was decently interred at the West-end of S[t] James's chur-yard Westminster the Corpse of the late Rev[d]. M[r]. Henry Hall, formerly of S. John's Col. Cambridge, who had travelled very much in foreign parts, from whence he was but lately returned. He was an accomplished Gent. of singular learning, modesty and other valuable qualifications, which in other times might have rendered him an Ornament to the

[1] Nichols's *Lit. An.* i. 252–3.

highest station in his Profession. He was justly lamented by all who enjoy'd the happiness of his acquaintance.

The writer evidently did not know that he was a Nonjuring bishop, which is not surprising, as such bishops were addressed, even by Nonjurors, simply as 'Mr. So-and-so.'

It is somewhat strange that little or nothing should be known about the next bishop, who bore a famous name, and belonged to a family which preserved the Nonjuring traditions after they had nearly died out elsewhere. *Thomas Brett*, the younger, was consecrated by his father, Thomas Brett, the elder, John Griffin and Archibald Campbell, April 9, 1727; he was, of course, on the Usagers' side, and took part with his father in one consecration. But he must have died early; for, whereas we hear much about his brother Nicholas (who was chaplain to Sir Robert Cotton, and afterwards lived in the family house of the Bretts, Spring Grove, and is described as 'a man universally esteemed for his great learning, general knowledge, and extensive benevolence'),[1] we hear nothing of Thomas. In a biographical notice of the elder Thomas Brett it is said that 'he left a widow and one surviving son'; as Nicholas certainly survived him for many years, dying in 1776, it would seem that Thomas died before his father.

The next consecration was that of a man who in common gratitude ought never to be forgotten by those who take an interest in the history of the Nonjurors; for more than any other man he has supplied original, contemporary, and trustworthy information which is simply

[1] See *Monuments of Kent*, by Philip Parsons, minister of Wye, p. 4. See also *Letters relating to the State of the Church of England with respect to the Roman Church, both in her Doctrine and Practice*, by Dr. Brett, edited by T. Bowdler, 1850. There Nicholas occurs, but not Thomas.

invaluable for that history. The reader of the preceding pages will have already anticipated the name.

Richard Rawlinson (1690–1755) was the son of Sir Thomas Rawlinson, a London citizen, a vintner, who was Lord Mayor in 1705, and had been knighted twenty years previously. Richard was the fourth son in a family of fifteen children; but his father was probably a rich man who could afford to give all his children a good education. Richard passed from St. Paul's School to Eton, and thence to St. John's College, Oxford, where he entered as a commoner in March 1707–8. His father died in November 1708, when he became a gentleman-commoner and graduated in 1711. While still an undergraduate he began to develop his taste for antiquities and curious literature, for as early as 1709 Hearne refers to him in connection with these topics; and he became so well known that at the early age of twenty-four he was elected Fellow of the Royal Society. All through his life his tastes seem to have been antiquarian and topographical more than ecclesiastical; so, from the point of view of this book, he will not require so long a notice as his priceless services to the subject before us might seem to demand. Being a staunch Nonjuror and Jacobite he did not, of course, seek Holy Orders in the Established Church, but he was ordained deacon by Collier on St. Matthias's Day, 1716, and priest on the following Sunday. He concealed, however, his clerical office, dressing as a layman, and requesting his friends not to address him as 'reverend.' He travelled largely both at home and abroad, following his favourite pursuits until 1726, when his elder brother, Thomas, a man of kindred tastes and principles, died; then he settled in London, living, it is said, in a garret in Gray's Inn. The oratory in Gray's Inn is sometimes called 'Dr. Rawlinson's Chapel,' but

more frequently 'Mr. Blackbourne's,' the latter being the regular minister. It was on the Festival of the Annunciation (March 25), 1728, that Rawlinson, or, as he himself puts it, 'xxx xxxxxxxx was consecrated by Mr. Gandy, Doughty and Blackbourne, in Mr. Gandy's Chapell, in presence of Mr. Richard Russell, John Lindsay, Rob. Gordoun, Thos. Martyn, Rich. Tireman, Tho. Peirce, Tho. Gyles and John Martyn, jun^{r}.' He was a Non-Usager, and joined in a declaration against the Usages; but he took little or no part in Nonjuring affairs, and as he says that he had been 'over-prevailed to be more public' than he desired, it is not unlikely that he would have preferred not to have been made a bishop at all. The collecting of rare editions, rare MSS., coins, seals, quaint inscriptions and epitaphs—in short, the pursuits of a virtuoso—were more to his mind. At the same time it must be remembered that it is to this same inquiring mind applied to other subjects that we owe vast stores of information respecting the Nonjurors. For Dr. Rawlinson was quite as much interested in contemporary matters with which he was, or had been, connected. Thus, his very first literary project seems to have been a Life of Anthony Wood, whose memory was still fresh at Oxford when Rawlinson went into residence; he made great preparations for writing a history of Eton College, collected materials for a continuation of Wood's 'Athenæ Oxonienses,' which, of course, would soon have brought him to his own contemporaries, and also for a History of the Nonjurors.[1] Happily the materials for both the latter works are still extant in manuscript, and have been largely drawn upon for the composition of the present volume. But it is not only for his own manuscripts that students of Nonjuring

[1] See *Reliquiæ Hearnianæ*, iii. 160.

history are indebted to Dr. Rawlinson. To him also they owe the preservation of the Hearne manuscripts, a treasury which has as yet been only partially unlocked, but which, even as far as it has gone, is priceless. For it was Rawlinson who bought all Hearne's Collections and diaries of the widow of Hilkiah Bedford for 105*l.*, Hearne having left them to Thomas Bedford, the son of Hilkiah; and, as Rawlinson left all his manuscripts to the Bodleian Library, Hearne returned, as it were, after his death to the place where he had spent so much of his life. Dr. Rawlinson was in some respects eccentric, and if it were the object of this book to make people laugh it would be easy to give specimens, more or less authentic, of his eccentricity. But it would be very ungracious in one who owes so much to him to repeat the idle tales, none of which, however, are inconsistent with his character as a Christian and a Churchman. Rawlinson's information on all subjects, including that with which we are now specially concerned, is thoroughly to be relied on, and that is the main point. It will suffice to add that some time after the death of his elder brother, Thomas, he removed from Gray's Inn to London House (so called because it had once been a residence of the bishops of London), in Aldersgate, but died at Islington on April 6, 1755, and was buried in St. Giles's Church, Oxford—Oxford being a fitting resting-place for one who had been a great benefactor to the University while living, and a still greater one by the bequests which he left to it at his death.

The next bishop was a man of high type, both intellectually and spiritually. *George Smith* (1693–1756) was a native of Durham. His father, John Smith, a prebendary of Durham, was one of eleven brothers, all of whom rose to more or less eminence, especially Joseph, who was a noted Provost of Queen's College, Oxford;

his mother's maiden name was Cooper, and her sister married Hilkiah Bedford; his godfather was the well-known Sir George Wheler, after whom he was named. He was educated at Westminster, living with his uncle, Hilkiah Bedford, who, as we have seen, kept a flourishing boarding-house for Westminster boys. Thence he proceeded in 1709 to St. John's College, Cambridge, but removed in 1711 to Queen's College, Oxford, where his uncle, Joseph Smith, was then fellow. He next became a student at the Inner Temple; but in 1715 his father died, leaving him a good fortune, and in 1717 he bought New Burn Hall, near Durham, where he resided as a country gentleman. He married his cousin, Christian, eldest daughter of Hilkiah Bedford, by whom he had a numerous family, and who survived him for twenty-five years. When he became a Nonjuror and when he received Holy Orders is not known; his name does not occur in Rawlinson's list of Nonjuring ordinations. Indeed, I find no notice of him in this connection until St. Stephen's Day, 1728, when he was consecrated a bishop on the Non-usagers' side by Gandy, Blackbourne and Rawlinson. His valuable writings do not bear directly upon the Nonjuring question, and therefore do not belong to this chapter, with the exception of a tract entitled 'A Defence of the Communion Office of the Church of England,' that is, as against the New Communion Office of the Usagers; but his most valuable contribution to the Usages controversy was his attempt to end it. To him, on the one side, and Dr. Brett on the other, is mainly due the partial reunion of the two sections of Nonjurors in 1731, and he and the two Bretts joined in the consecration of a bishop who represented both sides in that year.[1] Some

[1] There are some interesting letters (MS.) preserved in the Library of St. John's College, Cambridge, from the Scotch bishop, John Gillan, to

years after he became a bishop he wrote two treatises on a subject in which both sections of the Nonjurors were interested—the sacrificial character of the Eucharist, measurings swords with no less an antagonist than the mighty Dr. Waterland. The first is entitled 'An Epistolary Dissertation Addressed to the Clergy of Middlesex wherein the Doctrine of St. Austin concerning the Christian Sacrifice is set in a true light. By way of Reply to Dr. Waterland's late Charge to them. By a Divine of the University of Cambridge (1739).' He is characteristically courteous to his opponent. 'Our Doctrine,' he writes, 'of Sacrifice was, in the dispute between the late Dr. Hickes and his opponents, formerly cryed down as Popish; of this Imputation Dr. Waterland has been so just as to clear it, for which we cannot but return him our thanks;' and he ends: 'I hope I have said nothing which can give your worthy Archdeacon, whose uncommon learning and merit I highly reverence, any reasonable offence: and if this Controversy is to be continued I hope it will be carried on in a friendly and Christian manner.' In connection with the same great divine Smith published 'An Historical Account of the Primitive Invocation or Prayer for a Blessing upon the Eucharistic Elements. . . A Confirmation of some things mentioned in the learned Dr. Waterland's Review, and by way of Supplement to it. In a Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, 1740.' The controversy was ended by the death of Dr. Waterland in the year in which this letter was published. Bishop George Smith died on November 4, 1756, and was buried at St. Oswald's, Durham, where there is an English inscription on his tomb in the churchyard, and a Latin

George Smith, in which Gillan congratulates Smith on his efforts to bring about reunion: 'God will certainly reward you for contributing to so meritorious a work. B. are the peacemakers,' and so forth.

one on a monument to him in the church. He will meet us again as a learned writer and editor of works not connected with the Nonjuring question.

Of the bishop who represented the union effected by the Christian efforts of Smith and Brett, all that appears to be known is that his name was Timothy Mawman, that he graduated from Queen's College, Oxford, in 1705, that he was consecrated in July 1731, and that he joined with the elder Brett and Smith in consecrating the next and last bishop of the regular succession among the Nonjurors on St. Barnabas's Day, 1741. Thus ten years elapsed before another consecration followed that of Mawman, a fact which in itself is sufficient to show that the party was dying out, for in the preceding ten years there had been no less than nine consecrations. But the new bishop survived for many years, and heroically kept together the last congregation of regular Nonjurors after the rest had melted away.

Robert Gordon, or Gordoun (d. 1779), was a Scotchman by birth, and was brought up in what he calls the 'Scottish Nonjurant Church,' but from his early years he had been connected with the English Church, and that connection was strengthened by his marriage. We gain a curious glimpse of his early years from the interesting collection of letters entitled 'The Lyon in Mourning,' for the preservation of which we are indebted to Robert Forbes, Bishop of Ross and Caithness, and for their publication to the Scottish History Society. We learn from these that he was probably educated at Durham, for he told Bishop Forbes in 1769 that

> he remembered well that, when eleven or twelve years of age, he had been in the quire at Durham with a crowd of boys, when Lord Crew was bishop, and he then saw several young folks confirmed, but that he did not remember that he himself had kneeled down and received that benefit. He therefore

begged that to remove all doubts and scruples from his mind I might make up that defect. I agreed, and to-morrow morning was accordingly appointed before breakfast for that purpose in his own bed chamber, none to be present but Mrs. Forbes only.[1]

In later years he was connected with Durham through his marriage with Elizabeth, younger daughter of Hilkiah Bedford, whose eldest daughter married Bishop George Smith, of Burn Hall, near Durham. Gordon frequently visited the Smiths at Burn Hall, on his way between London and Scotland, when he visited his friend Forbes. He refers more than once to 'Sister Smith' and 'my late brother-in-law, Thomas Bedford,' and we gather that young Mr. Smith, his wife's nephew, helped him in his ministrations in London. His home was in Theobald's Road, and there he ministered to a little congregation up to the time of his death. His oratory was probably in the immediate neighbourhood. Of his ministrations there we learn something from the same Bishop Forbes, who describes vividly in a 'Journal' a visit which he and Mrs. Forbes paid to London in 1764:

After dinner we drove to Bishop Gordoun's, Theobald's Row [*sic*], who, being abroad Mrs. Gordoun informed us where we were to lodge; upon which we wheeled about to Mr. Falconar's house, where Bishop Gordoun favoured us with a visit in the evening most kindly welcoming us to London, and telling us that Mrs. Gordoun would call for us next morning to conduct us to his chapel. Sunday, Sep. 30.—Mrs. Gordoun called for us in the morning and took us along with her to Prayers; and sorry was I to see the suffering Nonjurant clergy so poorly attended in England; only about 30 or 40 in Bp. Gordoun's chapel. Sunday, Oct. 7.—I performed Matins and Vespers for Mr. Gordoun, and was at the same Altar with him, where only about 30 persons communicated. S. Luke's Day.—I read Matins for Bp. Gordoun (when he informed me, upon asking, that there were none of the same character, but himself only in England), he performing the 2nd service at the Altar.

[1] *Lyon in Mourning*, iii. 231.

Then he tells us that Gordoun omitted the words 'militant' and

made this great addition, all sick *and distressed* Persons *particularly such as may be suffering in the cause of Truth and Righteousness*, &c. and added *Exiles* to *Prisoners and Captives*, made a long pause after these words, 'Departed this Life in thy Faith and Fear,' during which he and his people, with hands and eyes lifted up unto heaven were commemorating mentally such of the faithful departed as they should judge most proper at the time; and in the prayer of Consecration, he also made a long pause after these words, '*Hear us, O Merciful Father, we most humbly beseech Thee*,' in order to introduce mentally the Invocation of the Holy Spirit of God upon the elements of Bread and Wine. Immediately after the Prayer of Consecration he used the Oblatory Prayer.[1]

Bishop Gordon saw with great grief the gradual dropping off of adherents to the Nonjuring cause. He was an intimate friend and frequent correspondent of Thomas Wagstaffe, the younger, who held the rather anomalous office of Protestant chaplain to the Roman Catholic Prince, Charles Edward, and his sorrow at Wagstaffe's death in 1771 is heightened by the rumour that he was to be succeeded by young Mr. Smith, Mrs. Gordon's nephew, who was a sort of assistant curate to his uncle.[2] It was a still greater grief to him to hear about the same time that the Bretts of Spring Grove, hitherto the staunchest of Nonjurors, were about to desert the cause,[3] and he contrasts their conduct with that of the Bowdlers, who still remained faithful; Bishop Forbes was called in to the rescue, and made an ineffectual journey into Kent to try and persuade Nicholas Brett to adhere to the 'suffering remnant.' Poor Bishop Gordon seems now to have felt

[1] See *Journals of Episcopal Visitations of Robert Forbes, Bishop of Ross and Caithness, with Memoir*, by J. B. Craven, the Editor, 1886, pp. 30–34.

[2] See *Lyon in Mourning*, iii. 293.

[3] *Ibid.* iii. 334.

that there was nothing left for him but to wrap his robes around him and die gracefully; on March 5, 1777, he solemnly commended his flock to the Scotch Nonjuring bishops in a touching letter addressed to 'The Primus and his Colleagues of the Church of Scotland':

> Considering my age and infirmities I feel anxiety to provide for the spiritual comfort and security of the poor orphans of the anti-revolution Church of England, whom I shall leave behind me; it is therefore my earnest desire and request to your paternities, that you would vouchsafe to take the poor minished remnant under the wings of your paternal protection, receiving them into full Communion as sound members of the Catholick Church, by such synodical act as your paternities in your wisdom shall deem meet; wherein, right Reverend brethren, you will afford the highest satisfaction and comfort to your affec. brother and devoted servant in Christ.

He must have derived a crumb of comfort from the following reply of the Scotch prelates:

> We hereby declare upon every proper occasion our willingness to take under our care and tuition; and to receive into full communion with us, in all offices of Christian Communion and fellowship, as members of Christ's Mystical Body, all who are in communion with you; and we promise they shall be entitled to the same privileges, in the participation of the Holy Mysteries, and all other means of grace dispensed by the bishops and ministers of our church, equally with those under our pastoral care in this our ancient kingdom.[1]

Bishop Gordon was from first to last not only a staunch and uncompromising Nonjuror, but a most enthusiastic Jacobite, quite undaunted by the abortive attempt of 1745, and ready to the last to join in any measure for the restoration of the ancient line. He kept up a constant communication with the Chevalier, all of whose doings he reports to his friend Forbes, calling

[1] Quoted from the MS. 'Register of the College of Bishops,' i. 27–30, in the excellent *Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, by George Grub, iv. 90.

him 'The lady your favourite,' 'The lady our friend,' 'Cousin Peggie,' 'Poor Peggie.' The Bowdlers were faithful to him to the last; and their biographer, another Bowdler, worthy of his descent, writes of him:

> The Right Revd. Robert Gordon died in November, 1779, at a very advanced age. Bowdler attended him with the unremitting kindness which was due to his father's old and intimate friend; and 'never,' said he, 'was I witness to such piety, resignation, benevolence and true politeness. He was a truly primitive bishop, a tender husband, a warm friend, and a true gentleman; and so pleasing in his manners and unexceptionable in his conduct, that in spite of the inconveniences and insults to which his character and the times exposed him, he lived unmolested and respected by all who knew him.'[1]

Not quite all. Gordon, like all men who hold tenaciously unpopular opinions, had his enemies as well as his friends, and the most bitter would naturally be among those who had once held the same opinions, and afterwards abandoned them. Dr. William King had been the energetic leader of the Jacobite party at Oxford up to the accession of George III., and then, like many others, abandoned it. Such tergiversation would be sure to irritate Gordon, who adhered all the closer to the Stuarts the more hopeless their cause seemed; and as William King was a man who used strong language, we can very well understand how he could write about Gordon in very different terms from those of John Bowdler.[2]

There is a contemporary notice of Gordon's funeral: '1779, last week of November, reverential groups were assembled in Theobald's Road to witness the passing to the grave of the last Nonjuring bishop of the *regular* succession—Bishop Gordon.'[3] Probably his burying-place was

[1] *Memoir of John Bowdler, with some account of Thomas Bowdler*, p. 82.

[2] See *Political and Literary Anecdotes of His Own Times*, by Dr. William King, Principal of St. Mary Hall, Oxon., p. 191, *et seq.*

[3] See *London in the Jacobite Times*, ii. 352.

the same as that in which Robert Nelson was laid, for it was in the vicinity, and was much used by Nonjurors.

It might be expected that after the death of Gordon, and the winding up of affairs by the transference of his charge to the Scottish bishops, the history of the Nonjurors would come to a natural end. But this is by no means the case. There were two distinct offshoots of the regular Nonjuring body, both of which arose before the consecration of Gordon, while one of them survived his death for a quarter of a century. Belonging to the first were three bishops; to the second ten. But, without any disrespect either to the individuals or to their episcopal claims, it can hardly be said that these prelates stand quite on the same footing as the rest. For this, if for no other reason. The regular Nonjurors were most strict about the consecration of their bishops. Three bishops at least took part in the rite; it was always done in the presence of responsible witnesses; the acts of consecration were always signed, sealed, properly attested, and carefully preserved; and a regular officer was formally appointed as keeper of Nonjuring Church registers. But the irregular successions were each through one bishop alone, which was regarded as uncanonical by the regular body; nor were the names of the witnesses (if any) officially chronicled and preserved. The first irregular succession originated from special circumstances. It was made in order to meet a special want in the 'plantations,' and there is a considerable amount of mystery about it. The second arose from the dissatisfaction of one single man (who, by the way, was not an *English* Nonjuror at all) with the extent to which the Usagers had carried their return to primitive usages, and who made this new

division in order to advance it farther. It seems, then, the proper course to make these two offshoots a subject of separate treatment, and to proceed at present with the history of the regular body, passing on from the bishops to the other clergy and laity who attached themselves to it.

One striking contrast between the earlier and later Nonjurors was that the latter were a far less compact and united body, and had less of the *esprit de corps* about them. It was not so much that they *differed* from, as that they were *detached* from, one another, taking each his own line instead of working together. This was, no doubt, in part owing to the dispute which raged within the little community between the years 1717 and 1731, and which left its sting behind long after it had been patched up after a fashion. But there was another reason which is noticed by Mr. Hutton: 'As the body came to have less and less relation to the religious life of the whole nation, it became more and more literary, antiquarian, and theological.'[1] There is a tone of despondency in the later Nonjurors, when writing about their cause, which intimates that they had almost despaired of its success, and that all they could do was to liberate their own souls by giving a clear testimony, and then help the general cause of 'true religion and sound learning' as best they might. The faithful remnant was becoming smaller and smaller, and there was no tie that bound it together in any definite way. But when we turn to individuals we find there were eminent men among the later Nonjurors who will quite bear comparison in every way with any that could be selected at an earlier period. Let us begin with one who is, perhaps, the best known of them all.

[1] *Social England*, edited by H. D. Traill, iv. 531–4.

William Law (1686–1761) was a man who could hardly have failed to take a foremost place in any religious community. His outer life was very uneventful. He was born at King's Cliffe, in Northants, where his father was a grocer; went as a sizar to Emmanuel College, Cambridge, in 1705; was ordained deacon and elected fellow of his college in 1711; lost his fellowship on the accession of George I. because he refused to take the oaths; after a period of unsettlement found a home in the family of Mr. Edward Gibbon, grandfather of the historian, at Putney, first as tutor to the second Edward Gibbon, the historian's father, and then as 'the much-honoured friend and spiritual director of the whole family,' to quote the words of the third Edward Gibbon, the historian himself.[1] In 1737 the elder Mr. Gibbon died, and the household at Putney was broken up. Law, after another period of restlessness, retired in 1740 to his native place, and remained there until his death in 1761. Two pious ladies, Mrs. Hutcheson and Miss Hester Gibbon, daughter of his patron, placed themselves under his spiritual direction, and the three strove to live lives based on a literal application of the principles of the Sermon on the Mount, as adapted to modern circumstances by Law himself in what he calls his 'two practical treatises.'

In his remote Northamptonshire home Law was quite out of the main stream of Nonjuring life, and *quâ* Nonjuror he seems there to have stood alone. He always, indeed, had his little knot of admiring disciples—one might almost say hero-worshippers—with whom his word was law; but with one exception, and that a doubtful one, they were not Nonjurors, and there is hardly a passage in his works from which, unless one read between

[1] *Memoirs of My Life and Writings*, i. 17, in Gibbon's Miscellaneous Works, edited by Lord Sheffield, 1796.

the lines, it could be gathered that he was a Nonjuror himself. Nor could it be gathered by the casual observer from the ordinary course of his life. So far from absenting himself from public worship, he made a point of attending every service in his parish church; and in the touching regulations which he drew up with his own hand for his charity schools, his almshouses, and his clerical library at King's Cliffe, he showed the utmost loyalty to that Mother Church which had proved but a harsh step-mother to him. The rector of King's Cliffe for the time being was always to be a trustee for his charities, both for children and for 'widows and ancient maidens.' 'Every boy and girl at their going out of the school are to have a new Bible, and Book of Common Prayer distinct from it, given to them.' The girls (who were his peculiar charge) were to be 'constant at church at all times of Divine service, as well on the week-days as on the Sundays.' 'They must always go to church at all funerals, and placing themselves at those times together, all of them join in singing the psalm that shall then be appointed.' He composed a beautiful little 'prayer on entering church' for them, and at his request the Psalms were always sung at King's Cliffe Church.

Nevertheless, Law had more sympathy both with the Nonjuring and with the Jacobite cause than is commonly supposed. In his hot youth he had involved himself in trouble at Cambridge by giving vent to hardly veiled Jacobite sentiments in a Tripos speech, for which he was 'degraded,' and to those sentiments he adhered, though with much greater reserve and reticence, through life.

He wrote a fine, manly letter to his elder brother George to explain why he could not take the oath in 1715, and from the views expressed in that letter he

never swerved to the close of his life, forty-four years later. He never joined the active opponents of the new Government, for he had no mind to meddle with politics. It was a matter of indifference to him personally whether King James or King George were sitting on the throne; but his political sympathies were always with the exiled Stuarts, and his theological with the Nonjurors. From the latter he received priest's orders. In the list of ordinations in the Rawlinson MSS. this entry occurs: '(24) 1727, Jan^{ry} 18th, William Law, M.A., ordained preist by M^{r}· Gandy, present D^{r}· Rawlinson, M^{r}· Gordoun, M^{r}· Bowyer, M^{r}· Bettenham, and M^{r}· Charles Smith'; and from the same trustworthy source we learn that he was one of the witnesses present at the consecration of Bishop Henry Hall 'in M^{r}· Blackbourne's Chapell in Grey's Inne.' He took *some* part, but it is difficult to ascertain *what* part, in the 'Usages' controversy. On the whole, I am inclined to think that his clear, logical mind perceived, as the clear, logical mind of Charles Leslie perceived, that it was a mistake to make the Usages essential; in other words, that he was not an 'Essentialist.' But, as this is not a biography of William Law, it would take up too much space to go into the matter thoroughly, though it would be necessary to do so in order to arrive at a conclusion. He sympathised with the sufferings of the Nonjurors; for when poor Dr. Deacon's health and mental power broke down, and he was in dire distress, we hear of Law sending him ten guineas through John Byrom.[1] There are various incidental notices which show that the more active Jacobites and Nonjurors appreciated Law's talents and character as they deserved to be appreciated. John Byrom avowedly

[1] See *Private Journal and Literary Remains of John Byrom* (Chetham Soc.), ii. 545.

took Law for his lord and master,[1] regarding him with the same sort of reverence with which Boswell regarded Johnson. John Clayton, Wesley's Jacobite friend, when both were Oxford Methodists and very High Churchmen, refers to Law as a kind of final authority.[2] Two of the ablest and most noted of the later Nonjurors, Thomas Deacon and John Lindsay, both refer to Law in terms of high respect. 'I want sadly to see you,' writes Deacon to Byrom, February 20, 1729–30, 'to know what Mr. Law says of you. Thos. à Cattell cannot relish his book. O Christianity, where art thou to be found? Not amongst the clergy.'[3] Cattell was a clergyman, and the book was, no doubt, the 'Serious Call,' which had been lately published. 'Mr. Law,' writes John Lindsay to the same correspondent in 1753, 'has cured me of curiosity.'[4] The cure might have been effected either by Law's public writings or by private correspondence or intercourse, for Law and Lindsay were personal friends, though, owing to that detachment which separated the later Nonjurors, they saw little of one another.

The last sentence introduces us to another Nonjuror, who, though not of so lofty a type or so rare a genius as Law, was yet one whose attainments would have done honour to any community in any age of the Church.

John Lindsay (1686–1768) was probably a native of Cheshire, though his early history is rather obscure. He is said to have been of the same family as Theophilus Lindsey, the clergyman who became a Unitarian; and the difference in the spelling of their names is not fatal

[1] Oh! how much better he from whom I draw,
Though deep yet clear his system—'Master Law.'
Master I call him; not that I incline
To pin my faith on any one divine.
Epistle to a Gentleman of the Temple.

[2] See Tyerman's *Oxford Methodists*, p. 38.

[3] Byrom's *Journal*, vol. i. part ii. 429.

[4] *Ibid.* iii. 552.

to the theory, for in the eighteenth century people had not yet become at all particular about the spelling of proper names. He is described in his epitaph as an 'alumnus' of St. Mary Hall, Oxford, but his name does not appear on the books. He is said to have been first an attorney in Cheshire, and then, having received Holy Orders, chaplain to Lady Fanshawe; but he was then only a deacon, for we find in the Rawlinson MSS.: '1717, June 18. Mr. John Lindsay was ordained preist in Mr. Orme's Chapell (commonly called Trinity Chapell) in the parish of S. Botolph Without, Aldersgate.'

He acted, like Blackbourne, as corrector of the press for William Bowyer, and was for many years minister of the chapel in which he was ordained, succeeding Mr. Orme in that post in 1733, and retaining it until his death in 1768. His own description of his life in 1747 gives one the impression that his ministerial duties were rather light: 'I removed last Christmas from the Temple, and took a lodging in Pear-Tree Street, near St. Luke's, Old Street, where I spend my time chiefly among books, or in my garden.'[1] It was there that in 1764 Bishop Forbes 'drank tea with Rev. Mr. John Lindsay and his wife, near S. Luke's Church,' and 'received from Mr. Lindsay two of his own books in a present.'[2] He was certainly a correspondent of William Law, though it is not always easy to determine whether the 'J. L.' of Law's letters is John Lindsay or James Langcake. At one time he lived at Islington, for the Preface to his best-known publication is dated from that place, and in Islington Churchyard he was buried. The majority of his very able works are on general subjects, and will therefore be noticed elsewhere; and one of those which bear directly upon the Nonjuring

[1] 'Letter of John Lindsay,' quoted in Nichols's *Lit. An.* i. 376.
[2] *Journals, &c., of Bishop Robert Forbes*, p. 34.

question has already been noticed.[1] Most of the works assigned to Lindsay were published anonymously, and we have to trust to tradition for their authorship; there is, however, the internal evidence of the style, which is bright, easy, and scholarly, and corresponds exactly with that of the works which he published under his own name.

Among the later Nonjurors was another writer who was in his own day more widely known than either Law or Lindsay; he touched life at more points, threw himself far more actively into the political, if not the theological, interests of his party, and produced a standard work on a general subject which would find its way into quarters into which even Law's works, which were all exclusively religious, would never penetrate. Posterity, however, which rarely makes a mistake in such matters, has redressed the balance and placed Law far above Carte, who now comes before us.

Thomas Carte (1686–1754) was born at Clifton-upon-Dunsmore, where his father was vicar. He was an Oxford man and graduated B.A. from University College in 1702, and was then incorporated at Cambridge, where he took his M.A. degree from King's College in 1706. He then received Holy Orders, and became Reader at the Abbey Church, Bath, a post which he held for several years. He was known all the while to be a strong Jacobite, but that would not go against him in the reign of Queen Anne, especially in the last four years of that reign. It was not until the accession of George I. that his hand was forced; he declined the new oaths, lost or resigned his readership, and assumed a lay habit as some other Nonjurors for prudential reasons did; but this did not at all mean that he was ashamed of his profession,

[1] See *supra*, p. 284–6.

but simply that it was dangerous for him, thoroughgoing Jacobite as he was, to appear without disguise. He was suspected, probably not without reason, of being concerned in the rebellion of 1715, and for some time lay *perdu* in the house of Mr. Badger, curate of Coleshill, occasionally, it is said, officiating in Kettlewell's old church. This is by no means unlikely, for the Jacobite party was still very strong, and it was not the policy of the Government to inquire too closely into the political opinions of the clergy. He then became connected with Bishop Atterbury, acting probably as his secretary; so when Atterbury was committed to the Tower in 1722, a proclamation was issued offering 1,000*l.* for the apprehension of Carte. Happily for him the description of his personal appearance in the proclamation was absurdly inaccurate, so he was able to escape to France, where he lived under the assumed name of Phillips for six years, employing his time in the most indefatigable literary labour. He gained a well-deserved reputation for learning; and therefore, on the accession of George II., Queen Caroline, who was a steady patron of all learned men, no matter what their opinions were, interceded for him, and he returned to England in 1728. His valuable literary work will be described in a later chapter.

Thomas Wagstaffe, the younger (1692–1770), second son of Thomas Wagstaffe, the elder, is another distinguished man among the later Nonjurors, and it is only owing to the fact that he lived at a time when the party was dispersed, disunited, and diminished that he does not hold so prominent a place in it as his father. Whether he was an Oxford man like his father does not appear to be known for a certainty, but at any rate he became, as his writings abundantly prove, an excellent classical scholar, besides being a well-read divine; he was closely

associated with the leading Nonjurors, who showed their confidence in him by making him keeper of their Church records immediately after his ordination. 'In 1717–8 Mr. Thomas Wagstaffe, son of Mr. Tho. Wagstaffe, suffragan Bp. of Ipswich, was ordained deacon by Mr. Collier in Mr. Lawrence's Chapel; present Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Richard and Thomas Rawlinson, Mr. Sam Jebb and Mr. Rivett. Preist by Mr. Collier, at the same place, 25 April, 1719.' In the same year he published a pamphlet of fifty-seven pages in excellent Latin on the subject of the Mixed Chalice. It was written in reply to Samuel Drake, a scholar of no mean repute, who had preached in the University pulpit a sermon against the necessity of 'the Mixture.' Wagstaffe's pamphlet was entitled 'Vino Eucharistico Aqua necessario admiscenda,' to which Drake replied in 1721, in a long Latin pamphlet addressed 'Ad Thomam Wagstaffe'; and Wagstaffe rejoined in another pamphlet (1725) entitled 'Responsionis ad Concionem Vindiciae, &c.' It will thus be seen that Wagstaffe was a Usager and Essentialist. His powers as a Latinist are strikingly displayed in numerous Latin epitaphs, some of which may be found in the pages of Nichols and Hearne, while a still more interesting one has been discovered by the present rector of St. Margaret Pattens (Rev. J. L. Fish), which Wagstaffe wrote on his father, once rector of that parish. He was also an accomplished Grecian, and employed much time in collating the Greek MSS. in the Vatican and Barberini Libraries at Rome.[1] And besides being a classical scholar he was a good linguist all round. 'He could speak seven languages besides his own, and was as much at home in Hebrew, Arabic and Syrian [*sic*] as in Italian or French.' At what time he

[1] See, *inter alia*, the excellent article on the two Wagstaffes, in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

finally left England is not known, but it was certainly before 1738 that he went as Anglican chaplain, first to the elder and then to the younger Chevalier, and remained in that capacity for more than thirty-two years. He did not succeed in converting either of them, but he was highly respected by both, and by the Roman people generally. He is described in his old age as 'a fine, well-bred old gentleman, and, what is still infinitely more valuable, a sincere, pious, exemplary, good Christian, so conspicuously so that the people there [at Rome] were wont to say that had he not been a Heretic, he ought to have been canonised.'[1] It was Wagstaffe who kept Gordon posted in the latest information about 'the King over the water,' which information Gordon retailed to Forbes. Gordon felt Wagstaffe's death deeply, and wrote to Forbes on the occasion:

Jan. 1771. I am sorry that our hearty gratulations of the new year, to yourself and good Mrs. Forbes, should be accompanied with the doleful news of the death of my old, and very dear, dear friend, Mr. Wagstaffe, who departed this life full of days and full of honour and all true worth, on the 3rd ult. in a fit of apoplexy, which was notified to me by his patron [that is, of course, Prince Charles Edward], who seems a good deal affected by the loss, speaking of him in terms of high esteem and regard. But God's will be done, and His name ever glorified, who hath permitted it so to be. The good man departed will be the gainer in being removed to the mansion of peace and rest; and our temporary loss, though grievous to poor mortals, will be compensated in the reflections on the rare virtues and illustrious and edifying example of our dear brother, now happy, I doubt not, in the society of the faithful departed; to which society may we who survive prepare ourselves by constant and assiduous endeavour to be united—*Faxit Deus!*[2]

[1] See *The Lyon in Mourning*, and *Dictionary of National Biography*, Wagstaffe, Thomas.'

[2] *The Lyon in Mourning*, iii. 257.

It is rather remarkable that, though the Nonjurors were a small and an ever diminishing party, they seem to have had in an unusual degree the power of impressing their views strongly upon their own families. It is almost a commonplace that the children of religious parents too often fly off at a tangent to quite different opinions; it would be invidious to give instances, but anyone who is at all acquainted with the religious history of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries will be able to supply numerous instances for themselves. But it was not so with the Nonjurors. The Bretts, Wagstaffes, Bowdlers, and Bonwickes are instances, and now we come to another.

Thomas Bedford (1707–73), second son of Hilkiah Bedford, followed closely in the steps of his father, and is less known only because the later Nonjurors were a less united body. The few facts that are known about him all tally with what his circumstances would lead us to expect. He was educated at Westminster School, as was natural, since his father kept a boarding-house for Westminster boys. Thence he proceeded in 1730 to St. John's College, Cambridge, as sizar to Dr. Jenkin, the master. Being a strict Nonjuror, he could not take a degree; in fact, his residence at Cambridge must have been very brief, for Rawlinson tells us that 'Thomas Bedford was ordained deacon at × × ×, preist on St. John's Day, Dec. 27, 1731, by Mr. Gandy in his own chapell.' After his ordination he found a home and employment as chaplain in the household of Sir John Cotton; and we next find him in the county of Durham, near his sister, Mrs. Smith. It was at this period that he laboured in Durham Cathedral at his best known work, an edition of the chronicler, Symeon of Durham's 'Historia Ecclesiæ Dunelmensis' (1732). His last move was to Compton, near Ashbourne, in Derbyshire, where he resided until his death in 1773,

officiating as minister to the Nonjurors of the neighbourhood, but whether in private houses or in a Nonjuring chapel we are not told; if it was the latter, and Bedford officiated in it to the end, it must have been one of the last congregations of the regular Nonjurors outside London. At Compton he wrote an 'Historical Catechism' (1742), partly taken from the Abbé Fleury's 'Catéchisme Historique,' and did another piece of literary work, which shows him in a very amiable light. Though he was a Nonjuror, he became a great friend of Ellis Farneworth, the assistant curate in the neighbouring parish of Ashbourne, who eked out a scanty livelihood by translating foreign works into English. Bedford translated from the French the Abbé Fleury's 'Short History of the Israelites,' and made a present of it to Farneworth that he might raise a little money from the sale, for Farneworth was very poor and had two sisters dependent upon him for support.

What has been said in a former chapter respecting the difficulty about labelling laymen as Nonjurors in the earlier period is still more applicable to the later; for, in spite of much grumbling and occasional outbreaks of rebellion, the Hanoverian Government became yearly more and more settled, and the opposition to it more and more hopeless. Hence those laymen who were inclined to be Nonjurors, but were not obliged, for official reasons, to show their hands, were naturally less and less disposed to do so. Nevertheless, there were several laymen who deserve notice as being, at any rate, in full *sympathy* with the later Nonjurors. But we may begin with one who went further than this, and sacrificed his worldly prospects for conscience' sake as literally as any clergyman did.

Edward Holdsworth (1684–1746) was a very promising Oxford man, who, having taken his degree as demy of Magdalen in 1708, remained at Oxford as tutor of his college until the time came when he would in the natural course of things have been chosen fellow; but it was the critical year 1715, and, as Holdsworth could not conscientiously recognise the new Government, he resigned his post and quitted the University. During the rest of his life he earned a precarious living by acting as tutor in families where there were Jacobite sympathies. He had a high reputation as a classical scholar, particularly for his knowledge of Virgil, of whom Pope's friend, Spence (a good judge), says he had the best understanding of any man he ever knew. He used to study Virgil's works on the spot where they were written, and wrote much on the subject. But his numerous writings have nothing to do with the Nonjuring question, and therefore do not come under our notice. Hearne gives an interesting account of a visit paid by Holdsworth to his old University:

> 1720. Sep. 3. Mr. Holdsworth, lately fellow of Magdalen,[1] and now a Nonjuror called upon me. He is a right worthy man, and hath been lately at Rome. He shewed me pictures of King James III. and his Queen. The Queen is a very fine lady. The King, he says, is a prince of admirable sense, cheerful and finely shaped.[2]

Holdsworth finally settled in the family of Lord Digby, whose predecessor had been Kettlewell's kind patron, at Coleshill, and there he died, and was buried in Kettlewell's old church. His name is connected with that of another Nonjuring layman.

Charles Jennens (1700–73) was a curious medley, being on the one hand a great friend and supporter of

[1] He never was full fellow.

[2] *Reliquiæ Hearnianæ*, ii. 112.

the musician, Handel, who was the *protégé* of the Hanoverians and the abhorrence of the Jacobites; and on the other hand both a Nonjuror himself and a kind friend and patron of distressed Nonjurors. He was educated at Balliol College, Oxford, a stronghold of Jacobites, but never graduated, because his conscience forbade him to take the oaths. He can hardly be called a sufferer in the cause, because he succeeded to the family estate and became a rich squire at Gopsall, in Leicestershire. There he erected a sort of Ionic Temple, containing a monument to his friend, Edward Holdsworth, whose literary talents and Nonjuring principles he alike admired. The next layman requires a longer notice.

John Byrom (1692–1763) was a man of varied tastes and accomplishments; he was a quaint and pleasing poet in his way; the inventor and teacher of a new system of shorthand; a mystic, or rather a humble student of mysticism under the tutelage of W. Law; and a diarist worthy of being placed by the side of Pepys, Evelyn, and Thoresby. Strictly speaking, he cannot be called a Nonjuror, because, after many doubts and misgivings, he *did* take the oaths both of Allegiance and Abjuration in order to qualify himself for a fellowship at Trinity College, Cambridge, to which he was elected just after the accession of George I.[1] It was well for the Trinity fellowship that he had not yet come under the spell of a fellow of a neighbouring college. It was not till 1729 that Byrom became acquainted with William Law, whom he at once took for his 'master.' This connection would, no doubt, confirm his Nonjuring sympathies; but so far as active Jacobitism was concerned Byrom outran his master, and on one occasion was warned by him against being premature, Law telling him (as

[1] See Byrom's *Journal and Remains*, vol. i. part i. pp. 24–5 and 31.

Byrom records in his artless way, reminding one of the way in which Boswell wrote of Johnson) 'that there should not be so much talk about such matters; that the time was not now; that he loved a man of taciturnity.'[1] But Byrom had friends at Manchester who were much more impetuous and less reticent on the subject than William Law. Manchester was a stronghold of the later Jacobites, and as the Byroms were a very old and highly respected family, and formed a large clan in the neighbourhood, the adherence of the ablest and most prominent of them was warmly welcomed. Byrom certainly became more and more sympathetic with the Jacobite cause. As early as 1727 he had a sharp dispute with Sir Hans Sloane at a meeting of the Royal Society, of which they were both fellows, on the subject of an address to the new King (George II.). He became an intimate friend of Dr. Deacon, a staunch Jacobite and Nonjuror at Manchester, who always seems to assume in the correspondence between them that they were both on the same side. John Clayton, Wesley's Jacobite friend, and perhaps also the clergy at the Collegiate Church, influenced him in the same direction. Dr. Hibbert Ware distinctly affirms that 'the cause of the Jacobite party, which had become very strong [1730–1], was much aided by the powerful talents of Dr. Byrom,'[2] and Mr. Owen, a Presbyterian minister of the place, published, in 1748, a violent pamphlet entitled 'Jacobite and Nonjuring Principles freely examined. In a Letter to the Master Tool of the Faction in Manchester'—that is, Byrom. There is little doubt, too, that he joined with Deacon in producing a series of papers which first appeared in the *Chester Courant*, a Jacobite organ, and were published separately in a small volume

[1] Byrom's *Journal* for August 1, 1739.
[2] *History of Foundations in Manchester*, ii. 77.

entitled 'Manchester Vindicated,' in 1749. But in spite of all this we gather from his eldest daughter's journal, published in the 'Remains,'[1] as well as from his own conduct, that he did not commit himself, at least to anything like the same extent as his friends. His own position is probably described in the best known of his many racy epigrams:

> God bless the King, God bless our faith's defender,
> God bless—no harm in blessing—the Pretender;
> But who pretender is, and who is king,
> God bless us all! that's quite another thing.

Thomas Rawlinson (1681–1725) was another learned layman who stood somewhat in the same relation to the Nonjurors and Jacobites that Byrom did, but for a different reason. It was not because he would not commit himself, but simply because he was so immersed in his books and manuscripts that he had no time for other interests. He was the elder brother of the bishop, and certainly shared his views. He was educated at Eton and St. John's College, Oxford, but left the University after two years' residence to study at the Middle Temple. He was called to the Bar in 1705, but on his father's death in 1708 he succeeded to a large estate and was able to follow his favourite pursuit. He is said to have been the original of Addison's brilliant sketch of Tom Folio in the *Tatler* (No. 158). If this be so, Addison is extremely unjust to him, for he describes him as a sort of freethinker, which

[1] Vol. ii. part ii. pp. 335–414. Miss Byrom's *Journal* gives a most vivid and delightful account of the rising of '45, so far as Manchester was concerned; it is all the more delightful and, indeed, trustworthy, because it is given with the fresh artlessness of a young girl, who simply tells what she saw and heard on the spot. She describes the panic that prevailed, gives the names of many who joined the Prince's standard, and of others who were very cautious; among the latter was Dr. Byrom: 'My papa and my uncle are gone to consult with Mr. Croxton, Mr. Feilden, and others, how to keep themselves out of any scrape, and yet behave civilly' (pp. 391–2).

he certainly never was; but he was a Tory and a bibliophile, two characters for which the great Whig essayist had a profound contempt. Hearne, on the other hand, had a strong sympathy both with his principles and his tastes. He is frequently mentioned in the 'Collections' in connection with literary matters; but in one passage Hearne bears the highest testimony to his character in excellent Latin.[1] An extended notice of one who took so little active part in the Nonjuring movement would be out of place, but he furnishes one more instance of the attraction which that movement had for men of the highest culture, particularly in classical and antiquarian subjects.

[1] See *Collections*, ii. 285.

CHAPTER VIII

THE TWO IRREGULAR SUCCESSIONS

That the Nonjurors, with their strong convictions on the unity of the Church, should have had so many internal divisions is a painful illustration of the fact that when the process of dividing once begins it has a fatal tendency to go on making subdivisions and subdivisions, till there is scarcely anything left to divide. It is to the credit of John Blackbourne that when he was left alone as a Non-Usager among the bishops, he did not immediately proceed to consecrate a bishop on his own account. It would have been well if others had acted with the same self-restraint. But there were unfortunately two irregular successions, through the uncanonical action of two individual bishops, which have now to be considered.

The first arose in 1722, when, as Rawlinson tells us,

> Ric. Welton, D.D., was consecrated by Dr. Taylor alone in a clandestine manner.
>
> × × × Talbot, M.A., was consecrated by the same person at the same time, and as irregularly.

In justice to all concerned, it should be added that these two consecrations were intended to meet a very crying want, which all who called themselves Churchmen, low or high, juring or nonjuring, agreed in deploring; but this was not the right way to meet it. Of the two bishops thus consecrated it is easy enough to identify the first.

Richard Welton (1671–1726) was son of a druggist at

Woodbridge, and was educated at Woodbridge School, from which he was elected to a scholarship at Caius College, Cambridge. He graduated from Caius College in 1691–2, was ordained in 1695, and within two years of his ordination (1697) received the rectory of St. Mary, Whitechapel, to which was added in 1710 the vicarage of East Ham. Thus before he was thirty years of age he had received two good pieces of preferment in the 'Revolution Church'; but like many clergymen of that date, his heart was not with that Church; he was a Jacobite before he was a Nonjuror. Hence it cannot be laid to the charge of the Nonjurors that they had anything to do with a discreditable incident which took place in 1713. In that year an altar-piece was set up by the rector's directions in Whitechapel Church, representing 'The Last Supper.' The artist, James Fellowes, was instructed to take the Bishop of Salisbury (Dr. Burnet) as his model for Judas Iscariot, but was afraid of the consequences of such a *scandalum magnatum*. A less exalted personage, therefore, but one hardly less obnoxious to the Nonjurors, Dr. White Kennett, then Dean of Peterborough, was substituted; and that there might be no mistake about the person intended, Judas was painted with a black patch over his eye, just like that which Dr. Kennett was always obliged to wear in consequence of a shooting accident he had met with in his youth. Among the crowds who came to see the picture was Mrs. White Kennett, who indignantly recognised her husband. The dean brought the case before the Bishop of London's Court, and the picture was removed. It did not help the Nonjurors' cause, when one who was chiefly known as the perpetrator of this outrage was made one of their bishops; but it is only in a very modified sense that Dr. Welton can be called a Nonjuring bishop; in spite of his Jacobitism,

he held on to his livings until the Abjuration Oath was forced upon him, with a distinct intimation that if he did not take it within twenty-four hours he would be dispossessed and punished. Then he became a Nonjuror, and ministered to a Nonjuring congregation in Goodman's Fields. His later history merges in that of Talbot, the popular account of whom is as follows:

John Talbot was ship's chaplain of the 'Centurion,' the vessel which took out the first two travelling missionaries of the S.P.G., George Keith and Patrick Gordon, to America in 1702. Keith and Gordon fired Talbot with a zeal for mission work; and, at his desire, they asked and obtained leave from the S.P.G. for him to join them. Gordon died within a few weeks of their landing, so Keith and Talbot set forth on their missionary journey like a second Paul and Barnabas. They were both most devoted and successful missionaries; and, being also strong Churchmen, they of course found their work impeded by the fact that there were no bishops in America. They made a deep and wide impression wherever they went; but any priest who has been a successful missioner will at once realise that their work would necessarily be stopped everywhere in its mid-course because it would require to be supplemented by offices which a bishop alone could perform. No wonder, then, that Talbot's letters to the Society at home, still extant, are full of hints about the pressing need.[1] In 1704 Keith returned to England; and in 1705 Talbot settled at Burlington, the capital of New Jersey. As resident minister in the midst of a large population he felt all the more strongly the need of episcopal supervision; and it is said that he went over to England on purpose to present in person a

[1] See Anderson's *History of the Colonial Church*, vol. iii. ch. xxii. p. 72, *et seq.*

memorial to Queen Anne praying for the appointment of a bishop. He returned to Burlington early in 1708 and found the work growing upon his hands. He could not devote himself exclusively to his own congregation. 'I am forced,' he says, 'to turn itinerant again, for the care of all the churches from East to West Jersey is upon me,' and he again pressed upon the Society the need of a bishop.[1] Years went on, and he was still disappointed in his hopes. He again visited England, and rumours began to spread that he had become tainted with Jacobite principles; he associated himself with Welton, and in 1722 the two were consecrated to the Nonjuring episcopate as already described. Welton accompanied Talbot back to America, and went to Philadelphia, where he is said to have exercised his episcopal functions; Talbot returned to his flock in New Jersey. There is no evidence of his having performed any episcopal acts; but he was charged with having refused to pray for King George—a point on which American Churchmen, who prided themselves on their loyalty, were very sensitive; and the S.P.G. was constrained to remove him from his post. It is said that he afterwards withdrew from the Nonjurors; but he was too much broken down with age and disappointment to resume his work, and he died on November 29, 1727. Welton was summoned to return to England by a writ of privy seal; he embarked for Lisbon, where he died in August 1726. Hearne inserts an account of his death (evidently sent from Lisbon) from the *Reading Post*; and adds as a sort of postscript: 'N.B.—This is the famous Dr. Welton, minister of White-Chappel, who suffered much for his honesty, and was, it seems, made a bishop, and is now above the malice of all his enemies.'[2]

This is the story about Welton and Talbot which has

[1] Anderson, iii. 237.

[2] *Reliquiæ Hearnianæ*, ii. 258.

found its way into the popular histories; it hangs so neatly together, and there is such an air of verisimilitude about it all that it seems almost like sacrilege to cast even the shadow of a doubt upon any part of it. And, indeed, the Welton part may be accepted without any misgiving, and the Talbot part also, until we come to the identification of John Talbot, one of the first travelling missionaries of the S.P.G., with ' × × × Talbot consecrated by Dr. Taylor in 1722.' On this point it is, at any rate, only fair to quote the words of one of the latest and best informed historians of the American Episcopal Church.

> It has been positively asserted that Talbot, when an old man, upon a visit to England, was consecrated to the Episcopate by the English Nonjuring Bishops. Anderson, Hawks, Wilberforce, and Caswall all say so, apparently all following the same original authority, whatever that may be. The Rev. Dr. Hills, in his 'History of the Church in Burlington,' discusses the subject exhaustively, and maintains the same assertion. In vol. i. of Bishop Perry's 'History of the American Episcopal Church' is a Monograph by Rev. John Fulton in which he re-examines the whole case, and arrives at the conclusion, which seems without doubt to be the truth, that Talbot never received such consecration; and that the tradition itself arose from confounding his name with that of another man.[1]

There was only one other bishop consecrated in this first irregular succession, Timothy Newmarsh. The evidence of his consecration is a manuscript notice in a copy of Hickes 'On Schism,' once belonging to Bishop Newmarsh, and later to his descendant, Dr. F. G. Lee. It runs: "Ye Dr. Timothy Newmarsh was raised to ye Apostolic Order in Mr. Blackbourne's Chapple situate within Graye's Inn uppon Sundaye, ye twenty-ninth day of May, 1726, by Mr. Henry Hall and Dr. Richard Welton

[1] *History of the American Episcopal Church*, by S. D. McConnell, D.D., 7th edit., p. 103, note.

in the presence of Mr. Thomas Martyn, Mr. Lee, Mr. Calvert, Mr. Burrows from Thame, and divers others.'

Thus ends the story of the first irregular succession, which certainly seems to me to be more excusable in its origin than the second. The cruel disadvantage at which the Church in America was placed through the lack of episcopal supervision might palliate almost *any* attempt to supply a remedy. But the second succession arose from what one cannot but call the wilfulness of one man, who, strictly speaking, had no right to interfere in English affairs at all, for he was a Scotch Churchman, and he was clearly travelling outside his province when he took a most important and quite uncanonical step on his own responsibility. Bishop Archibald Campbell had always been a 'Usager,' and surely, when the Usagers were successful all along the line, he might have been satisfied. But no; they did not go far enough for him in the direction of restoring primitive usages, so he took upon himself to consecrate a bishop who would go farther, and then another immediately followed; and it is to this line that the latest Nonjurors who lingered on in England belonged. Dr. Rawlinson's curt account is: 'Roger Laurence, M.A., consecrated by Mr. Arch. Campbell. Thos. Deacon consecrated by the same person at the same time.' He gives no date, but we know from other sources that it was in 1733. Whether Campbell consecrated both *solus*, or whether, as some say, he first consecrated Laurence, and then the two consecrated Deacon, is not a point of importance, and need not detain us.

Roger Laurence (1670–1736) had been an eminent man before he joined the Nonjurors, and when he joined them he held so conspicuous a place in their community

that it is a wonder he was not chosen to be one of their bishops in the regular line. His mental history is a peculiar one. He was the son of a London 'cittizen and armourer,' who was probably a dissenter, for Roger 'received baptism among the dissenters,' and was engaged in mercantile pursuits at home and abroad for many years. But he took to the study of divinity, and that study made him doubtful about the validity of his baptism; and so at the mature age of thirty-eight he was 'informally baptised at Christ Church, Newgate Street, on March 31, 1708, by John Bates, reader of the Church.' The matter was taken up warmly, among others by the Bishop of London, Dr. Compton, in whose diocese the baptism took place; and the case became a sort of test case to try that question which has always been a moot question in the Church of England, viz. the validity of lay baptism. Laurence was quite ready to defend himself, and before the year 1708 was ended had written and published anonymously a treatise entitled 'Lay Baptism Invalid, or an Essay to prove that such Baptism is Null and Void when administer'd in opposition to the Divine Right of the Apostolical Succession.' The book passed through several editions, and a warm controversy arose. A sort of episcopal conference was held in April 1712 at a dinner-party of thirteen bishops at Lambeth Palace (an arrangement thoroughly characteristic of the eighteenth century), and a declaration was drawn up in favour of the validity of baptism performed by non-episcopally ordained ministers. This declaration was then brought before Convocation, but after some debate rejected by the Lower House. Laurence had a host of antagonists, including four bishops—Burnet, Fleetwood, Talbot (of Durham), and White Kennett—and also one who was more formidable than any bishop, Joseph Bingham, who published

his 'Scholastical History of the Practice of the Church in reference to Administration of Baptism by Laymen' (Part I. in 1712, Part II. in 1714). It was originally intended to be only a single chapter in the 'Antiquities,' but grew on his hands, and appeared as a separate treatise to meet the arguments of Mr. Laurence. Hickes and Brett came to Laurence's aid, and as their knowledge of the Church was perhaps equal even to that of Bingham, they were most powerful auxiliaries. This brought Laurence into communication with the Nonjurors, and especially with Hickes, their head, who soon won him over; for we find among the Nonjuring ordinations, '1714, Nov. 30, Roger Laurence, or. d. by Dr. Hickes.' Very soon after his ordination he must have become minister of the Nonjurors' oratory on College Hill in the City of London, for within a year and a half an ordination took place 'in Mr. Laurence's Chapel' there. Laurence joined the Usagers, and was probably the writer of the tract already noticed, 'Mr. Leslie's Defence, &c.'[1] Charles Wheatley, the well-known author of the 'Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer,' was a friend of Laurence, and the fact that the one became a Nonjuror and the other did not in no way interfered with their friendship; so on Laurence's death Rawlinson wrote to Wheatley to inquire about his effects, to which Wheatley replied: 'I believe most of the books in Mr. Laurence's catalogue were in his library. Most of his chapel furniture I had seen; but his pix and his cruet, his box for unguent and oil, I suppose you do not enquire after.'[2] It must be remembered in reference to the last item that although the anointing with oil was not one of the four points insisted

[1] See *supra*, p. 299.

[2] Quoted in *Notes and Queries*, No. 52, October 26, 1850, above the signature, 'J. Yeowell, Hoxton,' an excellent authority on all Nonjuring subjects.

upon by the 'Essentialists,' yet the 'Offices for Confirmation and the Visitation of the Sick,' attached to the 'Communion Office' of 1718 which was generally adopted by the Usagers, included the use of the chrism in confirmation, and anointing in the visitation of the sick; and, of course, after Laurence's consecration in 1733, and still more after the appearance of Dr. Deacon's Prayer Book in 1734, the 'box for unguent and oil' would be essential. Laurence, however, only survived his consecration for three years, dying at Beckenham on March 6, 1736. The other bishop consecrated with him survived much longer and came more to the front.

Thomas Deacon (1697–1753) was probably, like Laurence, a Londoner. He was certainly in London in 1715, when, it is said, he 'was a prime agent in the rising.' As he was then little more than a boy, this seems impossible; but nothing is more striking in Deacon than his extraordinary precocity. This may have been the reason why Collier ordained him before the canonical age. '1715[–6]. Mar. 1. Thos. Deacon, ord. d. in Mr. Gandy's Chapel in Scrope Court, against St. Andrew's Church, Holbourne, by Mr. Collier in presence of Mr. Peck, Mr. Laurence, and Mr. Wignall, preist by the same Bishop, Mar. 19, 1715–6.' Hardly was he ordained priest when he was charged with exercising his priestly functions in a way which brought him into trouble. He tells us himself that he was 'accused of having absolved Justice Hall and Parson Paul at the Gallows, Tyburn, after the Rebellion in '15, and having declared that the act for which they dyed was meritorious.' But he absolutely denies the charge.

> I can not only affirm that I did not officiate with those unfortunate gentlemen in their dying moments, but also inform the Publick that the clergyman who did was the Rev. Francis

Peck, M.A., formerly of Trinity College, Cambridge; and can venture to assert that neither he nor any other person did then and there absolve them. I never said to them that the act was meritorious.[1]

But he owned to John Byrom that he composed the dying speeches of Hall and Paul,[2] and these, which may still be read, were remarkable productions for one so young. He denies, however,[3] that he was driven from England in consequence of his connection with these unfortunate men, and, in doing so, gives us a piece of autobiography:

> I staid in London, and appeared publicly there every day, for above three months after the execution of the Rev. Mr. Paul and John Hall, Esq. And when I went to Holland, it was not at all on account of my behaviour with regard to them. There I resided upon my own fortune. And so far was I from studying Physic, that I had not at that time the least intention of engaging in that profession; but entered upon, and prosecuted it afterwards in London, under the particular direction, and with the kind assistance of my best of friends, Dr. Mead.[4]

He does not mention the date of his return to London, but he was probably not long away, for we hear of him vaguely as 'once a Nonjuring minister in Aldersgate Street, London,'[5] and this must have been before 1719; moreover, his first publication (1718) does not appear to have been written abroad. That publication was a contribution to the Usages controversy, entitled 'The Doctrine of the Church of Rome concerning Purgatory, &c.,'[6] and

[1] See *Manchester Vindicated* [from Jacobitism], *being a compleat Collection of the Papers lately published in defence of that Town, in the 'Chester Courant'* (1749).

[2] See *Private Journal and Literary Remains of John Byrom*, vol. i. part i. p. 178.

[3] See *Manchester Vindicated*, No. 10.

[4] For an account of Dr. Richard Mead, see Hearne's *Collections*, iii. 124 and Nichols's *Literary Illustrations of the Eighteenth Century*, v. 149.

[5] See *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. for 1746, p. 390.

[6] See *supra*, p. 305–6.

is another striking instance of his precocity, for he was only just of age. The fact of so youthful a combatant rushing into the fray caused great offence. In the next year, 1719, a thinly veiled attack upon him appeared in 'A Dialogue in Vindication of our present Liturgy and Service: between Timothy, a Churchman, and Thomas, an Essentialist,' Thomas being obviously Thomas Deacon, whom Timothy taunts with his youth and with having been ordained at an uncanonical age, and pleasantly remarks, 'I see two things very ill coupled, Boy and Confidence'; and in 1720 Matthias Earbery, having attacked Brett in a rather rough fashion, turns to Deacon: 'Mr. Deacon's Hypothesis comes on the stage next, a very pretty one and worthy of his years.'[1] Deacon hardly seems to have deserved these mortifying imputations of youthful presumption. He owns modestly in the Dedication of his really remarkable book to Brett: 'I have followed your Precepts in producing the Records of the Primitive Church; I have appealed to Tradition which you have so learnedly defended; I have made your example my Pattern, though I am sensible I come very far short of imitation.' In short, he was content to be a humble follower of Dr. Brett, whom he very probably helped in the compilation of the Nonjuring Liturgy of 1717. He wisely took no notice of the attacks made upon him, and about the time when they were being made (1719–20) migrated from London to Manchester, where he remained for the rest of his life, thirty-three years, practising medicine with great success and ministering to a Nonjuring congregation. His oratory was in Fennel Street, but whether in his own house or in a room hard by is not certain. His 'use' up to the time of his consecration would probably be that of the book of 1718; but in 1734

[1] *Reflections upon Modern Fanaticism*, by M. E.

he brought out a remarkable work, the first part of which became the general service-book of this section of the Nonjurors. Deacon does not put his name to it, but there is not the slightest doubt that it is his. Its title is,

> A Compleat Collection of Devotions, Taken from the Apostolical Constitutions, the Ancient Liturgies, and the Common Prayer-Book of the Church of England. Part I. comprehending the Public Offices of the Church. Humbly offered to the Consideration of the present Churches of Christendom, Greek, Roman, English, and all others. 1734.

Part II. contains Devotions for Private Use. The compiler explains his object in the Preface thus:

> The following collection is founded upon two Principles. (1) That the best method for all Churches and Christians to follow is to submit to all doctrines, practices, worship and discipline of the Ancient, Universal Church of Christ from the beginning, to the end of the Fourth Century; (2) That the Liturgy in the Apostolic Constitutions is the most ancient Christian Liturgy extant; perfectly pure and free from interpolation; and that the book itself contains at large the doctrines, laws and settlements, which the three first and purest ages of the Gospel did with one consent believe and submit to.

The epithet 'compleat' is fully justified by its contents; for it contains, after General Rubrics, Calendar, and Tables, 'an Order for Morning and for Evening Prayer, Prayers for Catechumens, Energumens, Candidates for Baptism, and Penitents, with Forms of Admission, The Penitential Office (for Wednesdays and Fridays), The Holy Liturgy, Ministrations of Baptism (Infants and Adults), The Forms for consecrating the oil and milk and honey for Baptism, The Order of Confirmation, The Form of consecrating the Chrism for Confirmation, Private Baptism, Matrimony, Churching of Women, The Visitation of the Sick, The Form of consecrating the oil for the Sick, The Communion of the Sick, The Burial of

the Dead, The Form of celebrating the Holy Eucharist at the Burial of the Dead, The Consecration and Ordination of Bishops, Priests, Deacons, and Deaconesses'; and Part II. is quite as 'compleat' in its way, containing 'Devotions for Morning and Evening and the Ancient Hours of Prayer, The Hymn (the Sanctus) with the Proper Prefaces, Acts of glorification of God, Collects for Wednesdays and Fridays, Prayers for Fasting Days, Penitential Prayers, Thanksgiving for the Sabbath, Devotions to be used in Church, Devotions for the Altar, and an Office for the use of those who communicate daily in private, by reason that the Holy Eucharist is not publickly celebrated in the Church, Commemoration of the Dead, Grace before and after meat.'

There is also an Appendix containing extracts from a large number of English divines, and 'a Supplement, being an Essay to procure Catholick Communion upon Catholick Principles.'[1]

Deacon's Prayer Book of 1734 affords a curious instance of the way in which extremes sometimes meet. As the title shows, one of the sources, the first-named, from which it was taken was the Apostolical Constitutions, the genuineness and antiquity of which were matters of hot controversy. But there was one man at least who 'was satisfied that they were of equal value with the four Gospels'; nay, 'that they were the most sacred of the Canonical books of the New Testament.'[2] That man was William Whiston, the Arian, or, as he preferred to call himself, the Eusebian. He advocated as strongly as Deacon the practice of trine immersion and of anointing the sick, not, as both declare, for extreme unction like the

[1] A very full and interesting account of this book will be found over the signature 'H. J.' in *The Royalist* for April 1898, pp. 7–16.

[2] See *Memoirs of William Whiston*, by himself, pp. 179, 195, 389, &c.

Roman Church, but for recovery, according to the text of St. James, like the Greek. Whiston also professed like Deacon to go back to primitive times, as the title of the book in which his views are most fully stated, 'Primitive Christianity Revived,' shows. Deacon and Whiston were brought into a sort of connection through their common friend John Byrom, and there is a letter (April 1731) from Deacon to Byrom who had been canvassing for subscriptions to Deacon's proposed translation of Tillemont's 'Ecclesiastical Memoirs of the First Six Centuries,' and, among others, had canvassed Whiston; it ends: 'You may tell Whiston it is done by one who has the restoration of Primitive Christianity at heart as much as himself, and is a friend to the Constitutions,[1] though he cannot go all his lengths, being not quite so hasty in his judgment, but agrees with him in his wishes, foundations, and designs.'[2]

Dr. Deacon (he seems to have been called 'doctor' on the principle on which the poor always speak of their medical attendant as 'doctor,' for there is no evidence of his having taken a doctor's degree in either divinity or medicine) continued to act as physician of both body and soul at Manchester, where he was very highly respected. He was undoubtedly a staunch Jacobite, but he did not make Jacobitism part of his religion:

> I adopt [he says] no political Principles into my Religion, but what are expressed in our *Common Prayer-Book*, entitled 'A Compleat Collection of Devotions' which is entirely free from all objections of this nature; the Form of admitting a member into our church has not one word in it relating to State-matters; and I have told new converts that I hoped they did not apply to me on the account of National Affairs and Government Prayers, for we went on quite a different scheme.[3]

[1] That is, the Apostolical Constitutions.

[2] Byrom's *Remains*, vol. i. part ii. p. 499.

[3] See *Manchester Vindicated*, &c., No. 7, December 9, 1746.

But poor Dr. Deacon suffered cruelly in his own family for the Jacobite cause. In the rising of '45 his three sons all enlisted in the 'Manchester Regiment' under Colonel Towneley, and the sad result was that he lost them all: one was imprisoned, and then transported for life; another died while he was being taken from Manchester to London for trial; and another, Thomas Theodorus, was tried and executed on Kennington Common in July 1746. His head, together with that of his companion-in-arms, Thomas Syddall, was sent to Manchester, and fixed, according to the barbarous custom of the age, on the top of the public Exchange. When the bereaved father first gazed at the horrible sight he naturally took off his hat and uttered a prayer; and some had actually the brutality to complain in print of his so doing.[1] Deacon probably found solace for his troubles in congenial literary work, for in the same year (1746) he published a book entitled 'The Form of admitting a Convert into the Communion of the Church.' The book contained other matter which was only too suitable to the state of a party which was then being persecuted even to the death, viz.:

'A Litany for the use of those who mourn for the iniquities of the present times and tremble at the prospect of impending judgments,—Prayers for the Church,—Prayers to be used upon the Death of the members of the Church as soon after their departure as conveniently may be,' and 'An office for the use of those who by unavoidable necessity are deprived of the advantage of joining in offering the Sacrifice and of receiving the Sacrament of the Eucharist.'

In the next year (1747) he published another work, the magnitude of which is really not exaggerated in the following portentous title:

[1] See *Manchester Magazine*, for September 23, 1746, and *Manchester Vindicated*, &c., No. 1, October 21, 1746.

A Full, True, and Comprehensive View of Christianity: Containing a short Historical Account of Religion from the Creation of the World to the Fourth Century after our Lord Jesus Christ: as also the complete duty of a Christian in relation to Faith, Practice, Worship and Rituals, set forth sincerely without regard to any Modern Church, Sect or Party, as it is taught in the Holy Scriptures, was delivered by the Apostles, and received by the Universal Church of Christ during the first Four Centuries. The whole succinctly and fully laid down in Two Catechisms, a shorter and a longer, each divided into two Parts; The Shorter being suited to the meanest capacity and calculated for the use of Children; and the longer for that of the more knowing Christian (1747).

The 'two Parts' are: (1) Sacred History; (2) Christian Doctrine. The book is divided into 'Lessons,' nearly two hundred in number, and embraces in the most exhaustive way all the views of the 'Orthodox British Church.' Canon Parkinson refers to this work in a very appreciative notice of Deacon in a note to his admirable edition of Byrom's 'Remains': [1]

> It is much to be regretted that this admirable scholar did not receive encouragement according to his merits. His letters in this work show him to have been a complete master of the English language, of a ready wit and indomitable spirit; one who ought to have been engaged in a more congenial task than elaborating his learned yet somewhat arid catechism, and carrying on controversies with men incapable of appreciating his merits and their own immeasurable inferiority.

But it may be doubted whether Deacon *could* have found 'a more congenial task' than commending his system, in which he believed heart and soul, in what he thought to be the most effective way, though it was the way of an 'arid catechism.' Deacon was a strong man, and, though he was much opposed, exercised a strong influence at Manchester, not only over laymen like John

[1] Vol. i. p. 500.

Byrom, but even over the whole staff of clergy connected with the Collegiate Church. We have a curious picture of the man drawn by an unknown hand, probably his friend Byrom,[1] which is worth inserting: 'As the disaffection of the Town of Manchester has of late been the chief subject both of public and private conversation, I had the curiosity some time ago to pay a visit to that celebrated place.' After declaring that he saw no signs of disaffection, he goes on:

My curiosity being now pretty well satisfied with regard to the mobbing, I had nothing to do the next day but to make some enquiry after the Nonjuring Bishop and his Congregation which have made such an eminent Figure in History. The title of Bishop, and a Bishop, as I was told, of pretty near the same complexion with the Roman ones, gave me an Idea of some most venerable Personage, who never stirr'd out without his Equipage and proper Habiliments, with a posse of inferior clergy to attend him; but this Prelate I had an opportunity of seeing entirely unattended. He was dressed just like other men and proved to be nothing more than a Physician in the Town, of great repute for his Learning and Practice; who (having a Head turned a little more to religion than most of his Fraternity) had, by an industrious search into the writings of antiquity, discover'd, or thought so at least, a more pure form of worship than his neighbours. This he followed himself, and admitted others, dissatisfyd with other forms, to practise with him. As to his congregation it consisted, according to the account I received, of about a score of persons, the greatest Part of them women. Such is the man, who, one would think, from the rout which has been made about him, threatens the destruction of Three Kingdoms, the Toleration of whom, in the language of some people, is intolerable. . . .

The Doctor, I own, is respected by most of the clergy, and I will add by most of the Laity too.[2]

It is sad to learn from a letter of John Byrom to

[1] He writes, it will be seen, as a stranger to Manchester, but that was probably a *ruse*, to put people off the scent.

[2] *Manchester Vindicated*, No. 11, February 24, Tuesday, 1746–7. The last sentence is from the same work, No. 3, November 11, 1746.

William Law that Deacon's mind failed, and that he was consequently in straitened circumstances in his last days.[1] In 1753 he died, and was buried in St. Anne's Churchyard, Manchester, where the following characteristic inscription was placed on his tomb:

✠

Εἰ μὴ ἐν σταυρῷ

HERE LIE INTERRED THE REMAINS (WHICH THROUGH MORTALITY IS AT PRESENT CORRUPT, BUT WHICH SHALL ONE DAY MOST SURELY BE RAISED AGAIN TO IMMORTALITY AND PUT ON INCORRUPTION) OF THOMAS DEACON, THE GREATEST OF SINNERS AND THE MOST UNWORTHY OF PRIMITIVE BISHOPS, WHO DIED 16TH FEB. 1753, IN THE 56TH YEAR OF HIS AGE; AND OF SARAH HIS WIFE, WHO DIED JULY 4, 1745 IN THE 54TH YEAR OF HER AGE. THE LORD GRANT THE FAITHFUL, HERE UNDERLYING, THE MERCY OF THE LORD IN THAT DAY.—II. TIM. I. 18.

✠

Ἐν τουτῷ νίκα

Of the remaining five bishops in this line we have conflicting, and, with one exception, very scanty accounts. The first is Bishop Brown, who is said to have been Lord John Johnstone, younger son of the Marquis of Annandale, but I can find no trustworthy evidence of this; while two responsible writers, one of whom was a contemporary, give quite a different account. In Byrom's 'Journal,' which is generally to be relied on, we read: 'P. J. Brown, M.D. of Manchester (a disciple of Dr. Deacon), succeeded the Nonjuror, Mr. Kenrick Price, and like him had the title of Bishop.' The information is given in a note to a long, modest, and singularly able letter, headed 'P. Brown to John Byrom, Manchester, December 29th, 1760,' and signed 'P. Brown.' It was written in answer to a request

[1] See Byrom's *Remains*, ii. 545.

from Byrom that 'P. Brown' would send him 'one or two of the strongest reasons upon which the general opinion of the Apostles' writing the New Testament in Greek is founded.' Both the style and the matter of the reply are admirable, and the whole gives one a most favourable impression of the writer. If this was the bishop, it is most provoking that so little is known about him.[1] Mr. Aston tells us in his 'Manchester Guide' (note to p. 144): 'Dr. Deacon was succeeded by a Mr. Kenrick Price, a grocer, and the late P. J. Browne, M.D., who, as well as Dr. Deacon, had the nominal title of Bishops.' One thing seems quite clear, that Bishop Brown predeceased by many years *Bishop Kenrick Price* (1722–90), who from the above notices seems to have been the first consecrated. It is not quite accurate to say that Mr. Price *succeeded* Dr. Deacon, because he was actually consecrated by Deacon on March 8, 1751–2, and Deacon survived until the following year; but as Deacon was *hors de combat* in his later days, Kenrick Price might be virtually regarded as his successor. Bishop Price lived on until September 15, 1790, and was evidently during that time the ruling spirit in this line of Nonjurors. His epitaph, which is quoted in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for September 1792, says that

> for more than thirty seven years, without the least worldly profit, he presided over the orthodox remnant of the ancient British Church in Manchester, with truly primitive Catholic piety, fervent devotion, integrity and simplicity of manners, and every trait of character which could adorn the life of an unbeneficed primitive bishop. He died, Sep. 15, 1790, in the 69th year of his age, and 39th of his episcopate.

William Cartwright (1730–99), the next bishop, was a man about whom we have some really interesting information, which has been kindly corrected for me by

[1] See Byrom's *Remains*, vol. ii. part ii. pp. 617–23.

W. Phillips, Esq., of Shrewsbury, who has long been trying to gather correct information about Bishop Cartwright. He was the son of a William Cartwright, of Newcastle-under-Lyne, and was brought up as an apothecary. He received Holy Orders, probably from Bishop Deacon, some time before 1764, for we find him in that year described as 'one of Dr. Deacon's clergy,' 'living in his own house in London,' and 'married upon one of Dr. Deacon's daughters.' Our informant is Bishop Forbes, who on the occasion of his visit to London had several interviews with him, 'where free and open conversations passed between us without any manner of reserve. He appears to be a Person who has at heart to promote the interest of Religion upon true, genuine Catholic principles, and as one that asketh for the old paths.'[1] Cartwright himself tells us that he lived in London until 1769 or thereabouts. He then settled in Shrewsbury where he practised medicine, and was known as *par excellence* 'the Apothecary.' When he was in practice he resided in a house in the Mardol, but when he retired from business he went to live in the Abbey Foregate, where he died. Details about his ministerial life which otherwise might be considered trifling become interesting when we remember that he was virtually the last of his clan about whom anything really definite is known. We learn, then, from 'Salopian Shreds and Patches' (August 27, 1879) that he was consecrated bishop, 'after being examined by a superior, in 1780, by Bishop Price of Manchester, who came over to Shrewsbury for that purpose;' and his daughter gives us—or rather gave 'W. H. W.,' who imparted it to 'Shropshire Notes and Queries'—the following information about him:

[1] See *Journals of Episcopal Visitations of Robert Forbes, Bp. of Ross and Caithness*, p. 35.

Mr. Harley recollects being at my father's house the evening before my youngest sister, Sarah Alicia, was buried; that he accompanied the family to prayers (in an upper room) where my father read the Burial Service, and then desired all to dry up their tears, for she was happy. She died Oct. 3, 1797. My father had a room at the top of the house for the prayer-room, which was never used for any other purpose. My mother had a chamber-organ in the dining-room, on which she played; but I never knew her performing in the church service; though I think I have heard she had done so—probably when the congregation was larger.

There is elsewhere a fuller account, which, however, quite tallies, as will be seen, with what is stated in the last sentence:

The Bishop's appearance was dignified and venerable, his person handsome, and his manners those of a perfect gentleman. He appears by the benevolence of his disposition, and respect entertained for his virtues and learning, to have acquired the general esteem and regard of his contemporaries. The congregation, as far as the recollection of his daughter serves, was very limited; indeed, after the death of Dean [*sic*] Podmore, was confined to his own family. The service was performed by the Bishop in his dining-room, at the upper end of which was an organ, which his wife played. Over the fire-place was a painting of the Bishop in his Episcopal robes which is in the possession of his daughter, Mrs. Thomas, of Monmouth. This congregation went to Church, and he allowed his family to go there; he did not wish to be considered a dissenter. He wished to have the wine at Communion mixed with water. He administered the Sacrament standing on the Lord's Day, kneeling on Week-days. He confirmed at the time of baptism.

Then, after some details which need not be inserted, there is an interesting account of a baptism:

Elizabeth Helen, daughter of William and Elizabeth Thomas, was born, Friday, June 3, 1796, and was baptised with triune immersion on Sunday, May 7, 1797, being the 3rd Sunday after Easter; was confirmed with Holy Chrism, and communicated of the Eucharist the same day by her grand-

father, William Cartwright, Bishop of the Orthodox remnant of the Ancient British Church. Sponsor, the said Eliz: Thomas.[1]

Bishop Cartwright is a notable illustration of the fact that as the years rolled on the Nonjurors became less and less a political body. We learn this not only negatively by the complete absence of anything political in connection with him, but also positively from his own direct words, which are well worth quoting. In the 'Salopian Shreds and Patches' we are told that there is

a Letter of his dated Shrewsbury, 27 Sep. 1793 extant, addressed to Benjamin Booth, then a prisoner in Lancaster Castle for alleged treasonable conspiracy and sedition. Booth appears to have lived in Shrewsbury but removed to Manchester. Walker, a merchant in Manchester, with one gentleman, one surgeon, and several persons of lower rank, including Booth, were charged with treasonable conspiracy, and it happened that Booth was tried alone before the others, convicted, and sentenced to twelve months' imprisonment. But at Lancaster Assizes, April 2, 1794, the other persons were tried, and Booth, though then a prisoner, was included in the indictment. The whole were honourably acquitted, and the principal and only material witness against them, Thomas Dunn, was at once committed for perjury, and on April 25, 1794, a pardon from the Crown was granted to Benjamin Booth. The letter of Mr. Cartwright was written in belief of Booth's conviction on true evidence, and he says:

'When you wrote to me soon after the death of Bishop Price I little expected that ever I should have seen your name in the public papers on such an occasion as that which has rendered you so conspicuous, and reduced you to that situation which your criminal conduct has so justly deserved. . . . You well know, or once did know, that unfeigned allegiance, in all civil matters, to your rightful and lawful sovereign, is an essential doctrine and duty of Christianity. . . . Possibly you may deceive yourself with a notion that you were doing right in endeavouring to overturn the present established system of

[1] From *Salopian Shreds and Patches*, August 27, 1879. It is added in brackets: ['This narrative is copied from an unpublished MS. formerly in possession of the late Mr. H. Pidgeon, of Shrewsbury.']

government, because some of our religious predecessors attempted in the years 1715 and 1745 to dethrone the then reigning family. And give me leave to tell you that those attempts, whether right or wrong, whether justifiable or not, were undertaken on entire different and opposite principles to those on which you must have engaged with the new disturbers of the public peace. The former attempts were not undertaken to overturn or alter the constitution of the government of this country. No! it was a competition between a claimant to the throne, who was thought to have been unjustly and illegally dispossessed of his right, and him who withheld that supposed right from him. That competition, you well know, is now at an end. The one family being as good as entirely extinct, and the other having been so long time in uninterrupted possession, surely we need not now hesitate which of these God has chosen to reign over us. He has declared "by Me Kings reign"—and I believe there is not *now* one person of our Communion who does not recognise King George as the only rightful King of Great Britain.'

The bishop then exhorts Booth to 'repentance and the sincere contrition described in the CXLth lesson, p. 400 of our Catechism'—that is, the Catechism put forth by Bishop Deacon, 'A Full, True and Comprehensive View of Christianity,' in 1747—and concludes: 'Your faithful but afflicted pastor and friend. [Signed] William Cartwright.'[1] It will be observed that Cartwright addresses Booth not as one who had once been under his charge when both lived at Shrewsbury, but as being actually so now after his removal to Manchester; he seems to have exercised a sort of episcopal supervision over his late father-in-law's flock in Lancashire.[2]

In accordance with the sentiments expressed in his admirable letter to Mr. Booth, Bishop Cartwright was

[1] *Salopian Shreds and Patches*, July 5, 1876.

[2] See *Notes and Queries*, vol. for January–June 1856, on this point. This Booth is sometimes spoken of as if he were the last Nonjuring bishop. But the bishop's Christian name was Charles, and he was clearly a different person.

never hostile to the Church established under 'King George, the only rightful king'; and in his last illness, at his special request, he received the last viaticum at the hands of the Rev. W. G. Rowland, vicar of St. Giles's, Shrewsbury, and was buried by the vicar in St. Giles's Churchyard. Mr. Rowland has left some interesting reminiscences of Cartwright, telling us, among other things, that Bishop Horsley, when on a visit to Shrewsbury, startled some of the good people by maintaining that Mr. Cartwright was as much a bishop as himself. Bishop Horsley was just the man to make such a remark; he was far in advance of his day in realising the true, spiritual nature of the Church, of which 'Establishment' was only, in logical terms, 'a separable accident.'

But perhaps the most interesting point in connection with Cartwright is his relations with the American Church. It is well known that Seabury, after having been disappointed in his hopes of receiving consecration from the English bishops, 'turned his eyes to Scotland for the desired boon'; but it is not so well known that a similar application 'was made at the same time to the representatives of the Nonjuring Bishops in England.' Cartwright maintained a constant correspondence with Jonathan Boucher, a clergyman who, after the Declaration of Independence, had been driven out of America for his loyalty; another clergyman in the same predicament was Thomas Bradbury Chandler, and a letter addressed to him by William Cartwright fully explains the whole transaction in regard to the consecration of a bishop for America, and also gives an insight into the mind and position of Cartwright and the later Nonjurors of the time:

Shrewsbury: August 30, 1784.

Rev. Sir,—Yesterday I received a letter from Bp. Price of Manchester, enclosing a paper written by the Rev. Mr. Jonathan

Boucher of which the following is an *abridged* copy: 'Mr. [illegible] is requested to consult Mr. Cartwright whether the Re[illegible] Seabury can be consecrated by any Nonjuring bishop. [illegible] respect to temporals Dr. Seabury is, and expects to re[illegible] independent of any control from any State. But if there b[illegible] requisitions of a spiritual nature which Dr. Seabury, as a conscientious member of the Church of England cannot comply with, Mr. C. is requested to inform his friend whether he knows of any Nonjuring bishop or bishops, of the late Bp. Gordon's principles, and where they reside. From a review of the Liturgy at Mr. Price's, it does not appear that anything will be required which Dr. S. may not very safely assent to.' The answer to these queries I am requested to forward to you. I will therefore begin with the first of them.

When I resided in London, which I left near 15 years ago, I personally knew Bp. Gordon, but had no particular intimacy with him, as he was a gentleman of great reserve; but I was upon the most intimate footing with one of his presbyters, the Rev. James Falconer,[1] brother of the Most Rev. Wm. Falconer, many years primate of Scotland, now lately deceased. From him I was well informed of Bp. Gordon's principles and practices in Church affairs. I also at that time corresponded with some of the Scotch clergy, and from them learned that most of their principles were consonant with those of the Primitive Catholick Church. Since I left London I have often inquired after the State of the Church in Scotland, but can only learn of a few *licensed* chapels served by clergy commonly ordained by the Bp. of Carlisle. So my answer to the first query must be, That I do not know whether there be one *orthodox* Bishop left in Scotland or England besides Bp. Price and my unworthy self.

To (2) 'whether Dr. S. can be consecrated by any Nonjuring bishop,' I reply: We do not assume the character of *non-juring* Bishops, though undoubtedly our predecessors had it, and we derive our succession from the hands of those who acknowledged it. But we assume and acknowledge only the character or title of Bishops of the Orthodox British Church, or of the Primitive Catholick Church in Britain, which is now reduced to a small remnant; but yet such as I trust in God will so preserve the depositum, that it will again revive and flourish when

[1] Mr. Falconer is also referred to by Bishop Forbes, 'I read prayers for Mr. James Falconar at his chapel in Westminster,' &c. *Journals*, &c. p. 35.

men have sufficiently wearied themselves in the labyrinths of error and innovation.

(3) 'The Dr. is independent, in temporals, of any control from State.' Had he said that he was *independent of any Civil State in Spirituals*, it would have spoken our sentiments, and there would have been great probability of a perfect union with us. I may submit to the *Civil State* under which I live, in *temporals*; but in *spirituals* I acknowledge no allegiance or obedience to *any State*, but according to the laws of the Church Catholick in the three first centuries, and such as are consonant thereto, which I am persuaded the Established Church (and that I call the Church of England) in a great variety of articles most notoriously violates, and obliges her clergy to violate.

(4) 'From a review of the Liturgy at Mr. P.'s, Dr. S. may safely assent to it.' If Dr. S. can conscientiously officiate by that Liturgy at present, he would, when consecrated, be fully authorized to frame his own liturgy, if he chose to do so, and cannot be lawfully subject to any control, but that of the laws, customs and usages of the primitive Catholic Church. And provided he will so do, nothing more ought to be required of him by any consecrator &c.[1]

(Signed) WILLIAM CARTWRIGHT.

'In the churchyard attached to S. Giles's Church, Shrewsbury,' writes Archdeacon Allen in 1861, 'lie the remains of the last Nonjuring bishop in England, under a gravestone bearing the following inscription:

UNDERNEATH
LIE THE REMAINS OF
WILLIAM CARTWRIGHT,
APOTHECARY
WHO DIED 14TH OCT. 1799
AGED 69.
ALSO THE REMAINS OF
SARAH SOPHIA CARTWRIGHT,
WIFE OF THE ABOVE
WHO DIED 6TH OCT. 1801
AGED 70.

[1] See 'Bishop Seabury and the Nonjuring Bishops.' From a Letter in the *Colonial Church Chronicle*, for December 1849. The letter was procured through the kindness of the Rev. H. H. Norris.

It will be observed that there is a slight inaccuracy in this statement. Cartwright was not 'the last Nonjuring bishop in England;' there were two after him.

I am not aware that Bishop Cartwright published anything original except a lengthy Preface, dated 'Shrewsbury, 1797,' to a reprint of his father-in-law's 'Litany for the Use of those that Mourn,' &c., of 1746, from which we gather that he still adhered *in toto* to the theological views of Dr. Deacon.

There is also another Nonjuring Prayer Book connected with the name of Bishop Cartwright, the existence of which has quite lately been discovered by Mr. Henry Jenner. It is entitled 'The Divine Office, containing Devotions for the Canonical Hours of Prayer at Lauds, Tierce, Sext, None and Compline, to be used by all religious Societies where is a Priest and in the Houses of all the Clergy. Part I. Printed in the year 1761.' One of the two copies in the British Museum has a number of MS. notes in a handwriting which has been clearly identified as Bishop Cartwright's, and the name of 'W. G. Rowland, 1800,' who, as has been seen, was his parish priest. These notes draw a distinction between this and 'The Public Office Book,' that is Deacon's 'Compleat Collection,' and are written with an air of authority which Cartwright's position as a quasi-metropolitan of the little community clearly justifies. But, as Mr. Jenner points out, the most interesting point is that the title suggests the foundation, or at any rate the conception, of religious societies among the Nonjurors, not of the type of the 'Religious Societies' which had once been so useful, still less of the type of Wesley's 'United Societies,' but rather of that of Little Gidding. Whether any such 'communities' or 'societies' were ever attempted is not known.

The last two bishops of this line were Thomas Garnett,

consecrated by Bishop Cartwright in 1795, and Charles Booth, consecrated probably by Bishop Garnett some time later. Garnett is said to have been 'keeper of the communion-plate'; and his name occurs again in an interesting note in the 'Manchester Guide': 'The present bishop is a Mr. Thos. Garnet, who, it seems, does not exercise the Episcopal office, and the congregation, now reduced to about thirty persons, is under the guidance of Mr. Charles Booth, watchmaker, in Long Millgate, who in his own house performs the functions of a priest.'[1] It seems reasonable to presume that this Charles Booth was the future bishop. He died in Ireland in 1805.

One curious personage belonging to this line of Nonjurors deserves notice.

Thomas Podmore (1704–85) was one of those men who, without any advantages of education, manage by the sheer force of industry and intellect to attain to a considerable amount of learning. He was brought up as a barber and peruke-maker at Manchester, and became an early member of Dr. Deacon's congregation and an enthusiastic convert to his views, both theological and political. He was 'out in '45' in the Manchester Regiment, and then joined Cartwright at Shrewsbury and became master of Millington's School in that town, an office which he is said to have held for 'nearly forty years.'[2] As he died in 1785, this shows that he could not have left Manchester much later than 1745. When he received deacon's orders is not known, but he certainly *did* receive them, probably from Bishop Deacon, and helped Cartwright in his ministerial work at Shrewsbury, having previously helped Deacon at Manchester. He was buried, by his own desire,

[1] Aston's *Manchester Guide*, p. 144, note.

[2] A full account of Podmore will be found in Byrom's *Remains*, vol. ii. part ii. He is also noticed in *Notes and Queries*, vol. for January–June, 1856 and in *Salopian Shreds and Patches*, for May 24, 1876, and August 17, 1879

in the consecrated ground where Cadogan Chapel once stood, and where a Hospital for twelve decayed Housekeepers and Charity Schools, which still exist, were built under the will, dated 8 Feb. 1734 of James Millington, Draper and Nonjuror.[1] His tomb on the terrace at Millington Hospital bears this inscription :

✠

M. S.

REV$^{D.}$ THOS. PODMORE

ECC. ORTH. BRIT. DIAC.

OB: 10 APR. 1785 ÆT. 81

MAY HE FIND MERCY OF THE LORD IN THAT DAY.

And a more touching elegy was found among Cartwright's papers in the bishop's own handwriting :

On Sunday evening last died in the 81 year of his age, the Rev. Thomas Podmore, for some years Master of Millington's Hospital in this Town, and many years a Deacon of the Ancient Orthodox British Church, of whom in few words it may be gently said, 'He was a pious and faithful, and a peaceable, honest man, an Israelite indeed.'

He wrote a very remarkable work, to which, after the fashion of the day, he gave the following lengthy title :

The Layman's Apology for returning to Primitive Christianity. Shewing from the Testimonies of Ancient, and the Concessions of Modern Writers, that the Greek, Roman and English Churches, as well as the Pretended Churches of the Anti-Episcopal Reformers have each, in some degree, departed from the Doctrine and Practice of the Catholic Church : and pointing out a Pure Episcopal Church in England which teaches and practises All the Ordinances of Christ and His Church in their Evangelical Perfection. Written in the year 1745 by Tho. Podmore, at that time Barber and Peruke Maker in Manchester [1747].

[1] *Newbery House Magazine*, vol. ix. July 1893. Article on 'The Nonjurors,' by the Hon. Mrs. Bulkeley Owen. Also further private information kindly given me by Mrs. Bulkeley Owen.

It fills two hundred very closely printed pages, and its curious conclusion is worth quoting as a compendium of the tenets held by this latest development of the Nonjuring separation:

> And now, having found that the Greek Church is chargeable with having departed from the Doctrine and Practice of the Catholick Church in (1) Transubstantiation and Adoration of the Host, (2) Praying to Saints and Angels, (3) Worship of Images, and imposing these on all who communicate with her; the Roman Church the same, and further (4) Maintaining and imposing the doctrine of the Bishop of Rome's supremacy, (5) Purgatory Fire between death and resurrection without its sequence, (6) taking the Apocrypha into the Canon of Scripture, (7) withholding the Eucharistic Cup, or Communion in one kind, (8) rejecting Infant Communion, (9) Making Consecration to consist in the words of Institution, (10) imposing the *Filioque*, (11) not using Trine Immersion in Baptism, (12) disregarding the ancient practice of praying standing on Sundays between Easter and Whitsuntide, (13) and the Apostolical precept of abstaining from eating blood, (14) and the Saturday Festival, and (15) the Saturday Fast; the Church of England also chargeable with the last eight deviations, and also (9) maintaining the King's Ecclesiastical Supremacy, (10) rejecting the Mixture, (11) denying the Eucharist to be a Sacrifice, and therefore wanting Oblatory Prayer, and (12) Invocatory Prayer, (13) No Prayer for the Faithful Departed, (14) No Chrism in Confirmation, (15) No Unction of the Sick. And the Anti-Episcopalians, worse than any, having rejected almost everything, especially Episcopacy without which there can be no church.

He then points out that 'there is a Church which hath all these things,' and refers the reader to Deacon's works. 'And,' he concludes, 'if the pious Reader would know where such a pure, perfect Church as I am recommending is to be found, I will tell him in one word, at MANCHESTER.'

Bishop Cartwright's was the last Nonjuring congregation of which we have any authentic record; the

Nonjurors, therefore, may be said to have become extinct, or rather to have been reabsorbed coterminously with the eighteenth century. The two bishops who survived Cartwright are shadows, and the rumours of Nonjuring congregations lingering on in the West of England as late as 1815 are very vague. There were still, no doubt, individuals who sympathised with Nonjuring principles; but they showed their sympathy, not by forming congregations of their own, nor by standing aloof from public worship in the parish churches, but by the simple device of only using Prayer Books which were printed before the Revolution—a plan which was adopted very early in the Nonjuring controversy.

CHAPTER IX

THE NONJURORS AND GENERAL LITERATURE

It has been thought, on the whole, desirable to devote a separate chapter to the *general* literary work of the Nonjurors, apart from the sketches of the individuals who produced it, and apart from that *special* literary work which their Nonjuring position and their internal disputes entailed upon them. There is, of course, this obvious objection to the plan—that it is a putting asunder of what the fitness of things would naturally join together. But having frankly admitted the awkwardness of the arrangement, I adopt it for two reasons which more than counterbalance the advantages of the more natural plan of treating the writers and all their writings, whether they bear on the Nonjuring question or not, together. These reasons are: (1) The great importance of emphasising the fact that the Nonjurors could look beyond their own little community, and take an intelligent interest not only in Christianity generally, but in other subjects which engage the attention of cultivated men; (2) the desirableness of not drawing away the reader's attention from the real points at issue in the Nonjuring question, as might have been the case if, in the preceding chapters, space had been devoted to work done by Nonjurors, not *quâ* Nonjurors, but *quâ* Christians and *quâ* men of culture.

The dislocation will not, perhaps, be quite so glaring if the works treated of in this chapter be grouped, not according to their writers, but according to their subject-

matter. On this principle they may be divided into five classes—viz. (1) Practical and Devotional Works; (2) Controversial Works; (3) Historical and Biographical Works; (4) Poetical Works; (5) Miscellaneous Works.

(1) *Practical and Devotional Works.*

The sanctity of an oath, as a religious act, was the first guiding principle of the Nonjurors; the practical duty of patient submission to the powers ordained of God their second; the spiritual authority and independence of the Church as a spiritual society their third. These three principles are, in the last resort, not political, nor ecclesiastical, but simply religious. One would naturally, therefore, expect that 'works of piety' (a good old phrase now almost gone out of fashion) would take a prominent place among the compositions of Nonjurors. And so we find they do. Their practical and devotional works have lived, while many of their other works have died. Some who know little and care less about the whole Nonjuring question, and others who regard it as an entirely obsolete phase of thought, still know and admire the 'works of piety' written by Thomas Ken, John Kettlewell, Robert Nelson, Nathanael Spinckes, and William Law.

Bishop Ken's practical and devotional compositions in prose were all connected with his parochial or diocesan work, and were therefore written before he became a Nonjuror; but after he became one he stamped them all with his approval by putting forth later editions. They are few in number and slight in bulk, and one cannot help regretting that they were not more numerous and more bulky, for they are gems. In 1674, when he was working as a parish priest at Winchester, he published his 'Manual for Winchester Scholars,' to which an

adventitious interest is attached, because in a later edition of it (1695) first appeared the three immortal hymns which come under our fourth class. In 1685, being anxious for the good of the people of his new diocese, he published expressly for their instruction 'The Practice of Divine Love, being an Exposition of the Church Catechism.' 'The characteristic feature,' writes Dean Plumptre, 'of the "Exposition" throughout is, that the Catechism is turned in all its parts into a Manual of Devotion.'[1] It might seem as if it would require some ingenuity to do this, and that the result would be somewhat far-fetched; but Ken was so spiritually minded a man that it all appears to come quite naturally from him. In the same year (1685), and for the same reason, appeared his 'Directions for Prayer for the Diocese of Bath and Wells,' of which Dean Plumptre says: 'It can hardly be doubted that it was the direct outcome of Ken's ministrations to the prisoners whom he visited at Wells, and in whom he had found a "lamentable ignorance and forgetfulness of God."'[2] And so for this class he composed the simplest of simple directions and prayers; but for family prayers he commended those of the Prayer Book 'as being most familiar and of greatest authority withal.' A very different class of people, who frequented the other city from which Bishop Ken received his title, also claimed his sympathy. From the prisoners at Wells to the health-seekers and pleasure-seekers at Bath seems a far cry, but the good bishop had a heart for both, and so there immediately followed another manual from 'Thomas, unworthy Bishop of Bath and Wells, to all Persons who come to the Baths for cure, wishing for them from God the Blessings of this life and the next.' It is entitled

[1] *Life of Bishop Ken*, i. 231.
[2] *Ibid.* i. 237.

'Prayers for the use of all resorting to the Baths at Bath.' There are several other works of a devotional character which are attributed to Ken, some on strong grounds; but the limits of this work allow me to specify only those which are undoubtedly his.

John Kettlewell was a more voluminous writer on practical and devotional subjects than Bishop Ken. Like Ken, he wrote in the first instance for the benefit of his own flock; but, unlike Ken, he did not cease to write for them after he became a Nonjuror, because he considered that he was still their shepherd *de jure*, though not *de facto*. His first work which properly comes under the present head was 'The Measures of Christian Obedience,' published in 1681, and this was followed by 'An Help and Exhortation to Worthy Communicating,' in 1683. The former anticipates some of the reasons which led Kettlewell eight years later to become a Nonjuror; but it is essentially a practical, not a controversial, work; as also is the second, which is simply a summary of the preparation sermons which he was in the habit of preaching at Coleshill before the Sundays on which he administered the Holy Communion. Both were popular, and passed through several editions, but not so popular as the next, which appeared, in February 1687–8, under the title of 'The Practical Believer; or the Articles of the Apostles' Creed drawn out to form a true Christian's Heart and Practice,' which was a sort of supplement to his 'Measures of Christian Obedience,' but more elaborate. Almost everything that Kettlewell wrote was, more or less, of a practical and devotional character, and it is much more difficult to disentangle the Nonjuring from the practical element in his case than in that of Bishop Ken; because many of his works were written when he was actually a Nonjuror, while none of Ken's were, and

also because Kettlewell took more distinctly and less hesitatingly than Ken did the Nonjuring position. But most of these semi-controversial, semi-devotional works have already been noticed in the preceding pages, so I pass on to one which is exclusively devotional, and might have been written for any Churchman, Juring or Nonjuring. It is entitled 'A Companion for the Penitent and for Persons troubled in Mind,' and was first published in 1694; it was addressed to his late parishioners, and copies of it were sent by the writer for distribution at Coleshill. But one cannot but feel that this, too, was intended to be a supplement to a work published in the same year, or the year before, with a similar title, 'A Companion for the Persecuted, or an Office for those who suffer for Righteousness,' which is a distinctly Nonjuring work. There is a touching interest about his next work, 'Death made comfortable, or the way to die well' (1695), because it was written by one who was virtually a dying man. Several other works of the same type were published after the saintly writer's death under the auspices of his friend, Robert Nelson, but these hardly call for special notice; and finally, in 1749, a judicious selection from his works was published as a manual of devotion under the title of 'The True Church of England Man's Companion.'

Robert Nelson's practical writings follow by a natural sequence those of his friend Kettlewell, for it was Kettlewell who stimulated him 'especially to write for the honour of religion, which he thought might do much more good as coming from a lay gentleman than it would from a professed clergyman.'[1] Nelson's works were a reflex of his life; as he lived, so he wrote, simply to do good. The first was 'The Practice of True Devotion, in

[1] Lee's 'Life of Kettlewell,' prefixed to *Compleat Works*, i. 170.

Relation to the End as well as the Means of Religion, with an Office for the Holy Communion,' which was published anonymously in 1698. It was written, as he himself tells us, because he thought that 'the prevalence of religious controversies drew men away from the solid and substantial part of religion, the spirit and life of devotion,' and he wished to lead them back to it. Next came 'An Earnest Exhortation to Householders to set up the Worship of God in their Families,' also published anonymously, 1702. This was perhaps seasonable for the same reason as it would be now, because the great increase in the number of week-day services, which was a marked feature of that day, as it is of the present, has a tendency to make people put family prayer in the background. Then came by far the most popular of all his works, one which to this day has not been superseded; at least I know no other work which treats of the same subject in the same compass and in the same way. Its full title is 'A Companion for the Festivals and Fasts of the Church of England, with Collects and Prayers for each Solemnity.' It was not published until 1704, but it had been projected, and, indeed, commenced, at least ten years before; for Kettlewell, who died in 1695, was not only the original suggester of it, but helped in the beginning of its composition. Francis Brokesby also, whom Nelson often met at Shottesbrooke, is said to have had a hand in the work; but Nelson derived his most valuable assistance from his friend, Dr. William Cave; and, as Mr. Secretan points out,[1] a comparison between it and Cave's 'Lives of the Apostles and Evangelists' shows many verbal agreements between the two works. Honour to whom honour is due; Nelson's 'Festivals and Fasts' (to give it its familiar title) could never have been what it is without Dr. Cave's

[1] *Life of the pious Robert Nelson*, p. 164.

help, and its reader may have the satisfaction of knowing that he is reading a book which reflects the learning of one of the most learned theologians of the English Church. It is surely unnecessary to describe this really classical work; if any Churchman is not already familiar with it, the sooner he makes himself so the better. It had an unexampled career of prosperity for so grave a work. Ten thousand copies were sold within five years of its publication; it had reached a thirty-sixth edition in 1826, and it has been reprinted since.

In the same year, 1704, appeared another work in the catechetical form, like the 'Festivals and Fasts,' which, though anonymous, was certainly Nelson's, 'The Whole Duty of a Christian, by way of Question and Answer, exactly pursuant to the Method of the Whole Duty of Man, for the use of Charity Schools about London;' and in 1706 yet another, 'Instructions for those that come to be Confirmed, by way of Question and Answer'; but these have not lived, as their predecessor has done. The last-named was afterwards prefixed to another practical work by Nelson, 'The Great Duty of frequenting the Christian Sacrifice,' published in 1707. This, viewed in one light, would belong to our next section, for its very title shows that it committed the writer to one side on a subject which was being hotly controverted at the time—viz. whether the Holy Eucharist was a Sacrifice as well as a Sacrament. But Nelson, though very reasonable and moderate, was not colourless, and was not at all afraid to show his colours; he strongly contended for the sacrificial character of the Eucharist, being well backed up by his friend Hickes and by Johnson of Cranbrook, author of 'The Unbloody Sacrifice,' with whom, though a stranger, he interchanged some interesting letters on the subject. But the book was devotional far more than

controversial, and therefore belongs to the present head. The next work touched no burning question, except the question of selfishness. It was a most stirring appeal, entitled 'An Address to Persons of Quality and Estate,' pointing out to them the many ways and means of doing good. It may be regarded as Nelson's dying protest against the luxury and selfishness of the age, for it appeared in 1715, and in that year the author died.

Nelson was a man of many friends, but there were none for whom he had a greater respect than *Nathanael Spinckes*, who, like himself, was a devotional writer, though, considering the saintliness and ability of the man, not nearly to the extent that one could have wished. We could well have spared some of his tracts on the 'Usages' controversy for the sake of more writings of a devotional type. The first of this kind was entitled 'The Sick Man Visited and furnished with Instructions, Meditations, and Prayers, by Nath. Spinckes,' which was first published in 1712, and reached a fourth edition in 1731. It is, in the first instance, addressed more *ad clerum* than *ad populum*. It is in the form of a dialogue, and describes six visits from the minister to his sick parishioner, followed by some meditations and no less than sixty-three prayers, 'proper for the use of the sick on different occasions'; it is written in a very pleasant and homely style, and is well adapted for the purpose for which it was intended. Still more popular was a compilation commonly called 'Spinckes's Devotions,' but properly 'The True Church of England Man's Companion to the Closet, with a Preface by N. Spinckes' (1721). The prayers and meditations were collected, probably by Spinckes himself, from the writings of Laud, Andrewes, Ken, Hickes, Kettlewell, Spinckes, and others; and the collection became so popular that it reached a fifteenth edition in

1772. It was republished with an Introduction by the Rev. F. Paget in 1841, and has probably been used by many who were influenced by the Oxford Movement. 'Spinckes's Devotions' is a book frequently mentioned in eighteenth century literature.

William Law was, like Ken and Kettlewell, so saturated with the spirit of piety that, in one sense, all his works are devotional, while, in another sense, none of them is; that is, none of them can be exactly used as a manual of devotion. Practical, however, they are, and here it might be difficult to know what to include in the present section; but, happily, we are guided by Mr. Law himself, who calls the 'Christian Perfection' and the 'Serious Call' 'my two practical treatises.'

In fact, the proper title of the first is 'A Practical Treatise upon Christian Perfection.' This was published in 1726, and has passed through innumerable editions. It is a wonderfully powerful book, and had it not been eclipsed by the still more powerful one which quickly followed would have been even more highly appreciated than it has been. Its drawback, perhaps, is that it sets an impossibly high standard; it is 'practical,' but hardly 'practicable.' It should, however, be read in the light of the answer which Law himself gave to John Wesley when the latter, with his strong common sense, demurred to Law's view of Christian duty as too elevated to be attainable: 'We shall do well to aim at the highest degree of perfection, if we may thereby, at least, attain to mediocrity.' It should also be remembered that, when it appeared, religion in England was about at its nadir, and this may to some extent account for the rather gloomy view of life which Law takes; but the gloom is often lighted up by flashes of that racy, though somewhat grim, humour which is a striking characteristic of this

remarkable man. In the 'Christian Perfection' he begins the plan, which he elaborated more carefully and in greater fulness in the 'Serious Call,' of illustrating his meaning by imaginary characters. *Philo*, *Patronus*, *Eusebius*, *Lucia*, *Publius*, *Siccus*, are brilliant sketches—all the more brilliant from the sombreness of their setting.

In 1728 appeared 'A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life, adapted to the State and Condition of all Orders of Christians,' the work by which, of all others, Law's name is known. It would have been well if objectors had attended more to the title of the book. It is not, and does not profess to be, a devotional book, still less a complete body of divinity. It is simply, as its name indicates, a 'Call.' Regarded in this its proper light, it must be admitted to have been wonderfully effective. The 'Call' reached the ears of thousands, and appealed to them not in vain. It is less depressing, more brilliant, and more persuasive than its predecessor; but both are in their way unique, and produced an impression which no other books in the eighteenth century did. The odd part of it is that while they roused men's spiritual consciousness, and made them no longer content to lead a selfish, worldly life, they led them in a direction in which Law was by no means prepared to follow. It should never be forgotten that the 'Christian Perfection' and the 'Serious Call' were written by a Nonjuror—that is, not only by one whose conscience forbade him to swear allegiance to the House of Hanover, but by one who held the same Church principles, and was of the same tone of mind as the Nonjurors. In one sense, both the writer and his books were the exact antipodes of the Puritans, and yet they were the *primum mobile* of what has been, not very accurately, termed modern Puritanism. There was no

inconsistency whatever in Law's position; a man might perfectly well combine the Church principles, say, of Laud with the puritanical severity of Laud's arch-enemy, Prynne; but it had not been a usual combination, and the general public, which is not given to making nice distinctions, identified Law with a party to which in reality he never belonged. 'William Law begat Methodism' was Warburton's dictum, and it is a dictum which cannot be gainsaid. 'I prophesied,' writes a sapient gentleman, Dr. Trapp, 'that the two books would do harm, and so it happened, for shortly afterwards up sprung the Methodists.'[1] One point in common with the Methodists Law certainly had: he was 'an enthusiast,' and to call a man an enthusiast in the eighteenth century was like calling him a leper—a man to be carefully shunned. But in other respects Law was never a Methodist, not even in the wide and vague sense in which the word was used in the eighteenth century. He was always a High Churchman, tinged in his later years with a vein of mysticism which estranged him still farther from Methodism. Through no fault of his own, he was placed in a somewhat false position by his two practical treatises. He was judged by one standard, while he himself took another. John Wesley, Charles Wesley, George Whitefield, Henry Venn, Thomas Scott—in short, almost all the Evangelical leaders express their obligations to the two books; but they were never really in sympathy with the author. They appreciated and admired his piety, his earnestness, and his intellectual power; but they complained, and from their point of view not without reason, that there was too little of the Gospel in the books. Law took no notice of the complaints; he came down

[1] Dr. Trapp's *Discourse on the Nature, Folly, Sin, and Danger of being Righteous Overmuch.*

like a sledge-hammer upon Deists, Latitudinarians, and worldlings; but against men whom he believed to be earnest Christians he never lifted up his hand. But Christians of the type of Bishop Wilson and Bishop Horne—that is, the general body of consistent English Churchmen—were those who really appreciated, heart and soul, the 'Christian Perfection' and the 'Serious Call.'

One of the chief among their merits was that they tended to dispel the mischievous but very prevalent notion that piety was generally accompanied by intellectual weakness. We see traces of this even in the great and good Dr. Johnson.

> I became [he says] a sort of lax *talker* against religion, for I did not much *think* against it; and this lasted till I went to Oxford, when I took up Law's 'Serious Call to a Holy Life,' expecting to find it a dull book, as such books generally are. But I found Law quite an over-match for me; and this was the first occasion of my thinking in earnest of religion, after I became capable of rational inquiry.[1]

In the same spirit the first Lord Lyttelton, the poet and historian, took up Law's 'Serious Call' at a friend's house, and, having been so fascinated that he could not go to rest until he had finished it, expressed himself as 'not a little astonished to find that one of the finest books that ever were written had been penned by a crack-brained enthusiast.'[2] Gibbon, the historian, was perhaps predisposed to regard with a favourable eye the work of a man who had been his father's tutor, the honoured inmate of his grandfather's house, and 'had left in the Gibbon family the reputation of a worthy and pious man, who believed all that he professed, and practised all that he enjoined.'[3] Still, there is a ring

[1] Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, vol. i. ch. i.
[2] Byrom's *Remains*, vol. ii. part ii. p. 634.
[3] *Memoir of My Life and Writings*, Gibbon's 'Miscellaneous Works,' i. 14.

of sincere and honest admiration in the tone in which he writes of the 'Serious Call,' for which family partiality is not sufficient to account:

> Mr. Law's masterwork, the 'Serious Call,' is still read as a popular and powerful book of devotion. His precepts are rigid; but they are founded on the Gospel. His satire is sharp; but it is drawn from the knowledge of human life, and many of his portraits are not unworthy of the pen of La Bruyère. If he finds a spark of piety in his reader's mind, he will soon kindle it to a flame; and a philosopher must allow that he exposes, with equal severity and truth, the strange contradiction between the faith and practice of the Christian world.[1]

And, to come to our own day, one of the ablest living critics, though he differs very widely from Law's views, evidently admires and appreciates the 'Serious Call,' 'a book which palpitates throughout with the deepest emotions of its author.'[2]

It is with some misgiving that I omit to notice in this connection Law's later, mystical works, which were intensely 'devotional' in tone, and were certainly intended to be 'practical,' though that is the last epithet that some would apply to them. But they are not what is commonly understood by 'practical and devotional works;' they teem with controversial matter in every page; people who greatly admired the two books which we have been considering—Bishop Horne, William Jones, John Wesley, and Henry Venn among others—were repelled by his later writings; full of beautiful and suggestive thoughts as they are, the consideration of them here might introduce a note of discord into a subject where all should be harmony; so it will be better to accept Law's own description of the 'Christian Perfection' and the 'Serious

[1] *Memoir of My Life and Writings*, p. 15.

[2] See Sir Leslie Stephen's *English Thought in the Eighteenth Century*, ii. 395–6.

Call' as 'his two practical treatises,'[1] and limit ourselves to these two for the present.

Another devotional work written by a Nonjuror, which had a considerable reputation in its day, but is now, like its author, forgotten, was Abednego Seller's 'Devout Communicant, assisted with Rules, together with Meditations, Prayers and Anthems for every Day of the Holy Week.' It was first published in 1686, and became so popular that it reached a sixth edition in 1695. Then in 1704 it was republished, 'with many alterations, additions, and amendments,' under the following title:

> The good man's preparation for the happy receiving of the blessed sacrament. Together with an account of the Holy-Passion Week; and the great festival of Easter. With rules and directions how to fast acceptably; and how to communicate worthily. To which are annext, particular lessons, prayers, meditations, and anthems, for the several days of those times of strict mortification and holy joy. In two parts.

Mr. Seller also published two other practical works, 'An Infallible Way to Contentment in the midst of Publick or Personal Calamities' (1679 and 1688), which has been reproduced in our own day as part of 'Companions for a Quiet Hour,' by the Religious Tract Society, and 'An Exposition of the Church Catechism from our Modern Authors and the Holy Scriptures' (1695).

Besides the practical and devotional works actually written by Nonjurors, there were others which they either edited afresh, or stamped with their approval by writing a Preface or Introduction to them. Thus, George Hickes edited in 1701 a compilation made by Susanna Hopton, entitled 'Devotions in the Antient Way of Offices,' having revised it and prefixed an interesting Preface. This book is often referred to in Nonjuring writings, and it has been

[1] See *William Law, Nonjuror and Mystic*, p. 80.

said that it was sometimes used as part of the Office in Nonjuring oratories, but the evidence for this is not strong. Nathanael Spinckes also published another work of the same lady in 1717, eight years after her death, under the title of 'A Collection of Meditations and Devotions, in Three Parts.' Henry Dodwell published an edition of the work of his tutor, Dr. Stearne, 'De Obstinatione; or, Concerning Firmness and not Sinking under Adversities,' and also an edition, with a Preface, of St. Francis de Sales's 'Introduction to a Devout Life'; and Francis Lee, an edition of 'The Christian Exercise,' by Thomas à Kempis.

(2) *Controversial Works.*

The age of the Nonjurors—that is, roughly speaking, the first half of the eighteenth century—has been rightly described as 'an age of a thousand controversies.'[1] There was the Bangorian controversy, the Convocation controversy (nearly, but not quite, the same thing), the Trinitarian controversy, the Deistical controversy, the never-ending Roman controversy, the controversy with the Quakers at the beginning of the period, and the controversy with the Methodists at the end, and numberless minor ones.

In these controversies the Nonjurors took their full share, and always on the side of the Church of England. From their writings on them one would never gather that they were in any way different—as, indeed, except on their own peculiar stumbling-block they were not—from plain English Churchmen who took the recognised formularies of the English Church, and none other, as their standard. This is a feature in their history which has

[1] Bishop Fitzgerald in *Aids to Faith*, p. 48. Essay II. 'Evidences of Christianity.'

scarcely been brought out into sufficient prominence. Against the opponents, not only of Christianity generally, but of the Church of England in particular, Leslie and Hickes, Spinckes and Law, stood shoulder to shoulder with Stillingfleet and Waterland, Bull and Butler. There is assuredly reason in the sorrowful reproach of one of their number:

> It seems, Sir, the writing of Nonjurors is grievous to you. . . . You might have remembered the zeal they have shown for our common mother, the Church of England, and how they have been her constant champions against her adversaries of all sorts since the Revolution. . . . They have all along shew'd this zeal and affection for her, tho' since the Revolution they have neither eat of her bread, nor enjoy'd her possessions.[1]

Let us begin with that stout champion of the Christian faith, Charles Leslie. Leslie's deliberate purpose was to furnish English Church people with a full system of defence against all adversaries; and it was this purpose, rather than his love of fighting (though he was a born fighter), which led him to do battle with Deists, Jews, Socinians, Quakers, Romanists, in fact, with all whom he considered enemies of Church principles, from whatever quarter they might come. He made several known converts, and many, doubtless, unknown, by his writings, but, as his biographer truly points out: 'It was not to the Nonjurors as such, in opposition to the Establishment, but to the Church of England that he reconciled his converts; not attempting to impose upon them, or even recommend, the political obligations which he felt binding on his own conscience.'[2] Family circumstances seem to have led him first to direct his artillery against the

[1] *A Seasonable and Modest Apology in behalf of the Rev. Dr. George Hickes and other Nonjurors, in a Letter to T. Wise, D.D., on occasion of his Visitation at Canterbury*, June 1, 1710.

[2] *Charles Leslie's Life and Writings*, by R. J. Leslie, p. 178.

Deists. About 1686 Lady Frances Keightley, sister of his ever-constant friend the Earl of Clarendon, became an inmate of Charles Leslie's house. She had become unsettled in her faith by the arguments of the Deists, and Leslie tried to argue with her; but 'I found,' he says, 'discoursing with her had but little effect, for in that violent discomposure she could not give attention. . . . I then wrote this letter, free from all intricacies and suited to her capacity. . . . And by the blessing of God this had the desired effect.'[1] Though really addressed to a lady, the letter appears as 'A Letter to a Gentleman' for obvious reasons. It afterwards appeared, enlarged and revised, as 'A Short and Easy Method with the Deists.' It was followed by 'A Short and Easy Method with the Jews,' dated very appropriately 'Good Friday 1689.' In 1694 he published his first work on the Socinian controversy in 'A Letter to a Friend,' which was followed in 1697 by 'A Second Letter to a Friend' on the same subject, and in 1708 'The Socinian Controversy discussed in Six Dialogues,' in reply to Biddle's 'History of the Unitarians.' The Quakers were a far more numerous and thriving sect than they are now, and Leslie was brought much into contact with them. Partly for that reason and partly because their disregard of the Sacraments would be particularly offensive to a Churchman of advanced views, he wrote more numerous and lengthy works against them than against any others. To this group belong his 'Snake in the Grass,' with its sequels and supplements, his 'Satan Disrobed,' &c., 'An Answer to the Switch,' and 'A Treatise on Water Baptism.' It was also in connection with the Quakers that he wrote against the Muggletonians, considering the two sects as 'twin

[1] *Vindication of 'Short and Easy Method,'* quoted in *Life*, by R. J. Leslie, p. 22.

enthusiasts, which, though like Samson's foxes drawing two ways, their tails were joined with firebrands to set the Church in a flame.'[1] And, finally, he measured swords with the Roman Catholics, first in a public letter addressed to the Bishop of Meaux, the famous Bossuet, justifying Bishop Bull's use of the term 'Catholic Church' as embracing the English Church; this was taken up in consequence of Bossuet's letter to Robert Nelson on the subject in 1694; and then, after he had been brought into closer communication with Roman Catholics at Bar-le-Duc, in a work in the form of dialogue entitled 'The Case stated between the Church of Rome and the Church of England' (1713). When to these are added his Answer to Burnet, his reflections on Tillotson, his reply to Higden's 'View of the English Constitution,' and other writings against those whom he considered unfaithful members of the Church of England, it will be seen that Leslie pretty nearly boxed the compass of controversial divinity so far as England was concerned during his lifetime.

George Hickes was as keen a combatant as Charles Leslie; but he does not occupy so large a space under the present heading, partly because, as recognised leader of the Nonjurors, he, perhaps, felt in honour bound to defend with his pen Nonjurors *quâ* Nonjurors, and his works on this point do not come within our purview, and partly because he was more engrossed with non-controversial subjects, as will appear in a later section. But his contributions to one controversy are peculiarly valuable, not so much from their intrinsic merits (though these were not slight) as from the position which he held. He was supposed to be the captain, as it were, of the advanced guard of the Nonjurors—that is, of that section of them

[1] See *Life*, p. 174.

which was thought to approach most nearly to Rome; but his writings prove, if proof be needed, that he had not in reality the slightest tendency in that direction. He published in 1687 'An Apologetical Vindication of the Church of England,' which Bishop Gibson afterwards thought so good a defence of the English as against the Roman Church that he included it in his 'Preservatives against Popery'; in 1704 'Several Letters which passed between Dr. Hickes and a Roman Priest,' in which he defended the Anglican position with great learning and ability; and in 1710 'A Second Collection of Controversial Letters relating to the Church of England and Church of Rome and an Honourable Lady'—that is, the Lady Gratiana Carew. Innumerable sermons and pamphlets were also published by Hickes on controversial subjects, but these need not be specified in a general sketch like the present.[1]

What has been said about George Hickes applies also to his convert, *Thomas Brett*, whose chief writings hardly come under the present head; and those which do are quite as much historical as controversial. Nevertheless, his 'Account of Church Government' (1707), his 'Review of Lutheran Principles' (1714), his 'Necessity of discovering Christ's Body in the Holy Communion' (1720), his 'Discourses concerning the ever Blessed Trinity' (1720), his 'Answer to the "Plain Account of the Sacrament" [by Hoadly]' (1735), his 'Remarks on Dr. Waterland's Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist' (1741), his 'Four Letters on the Necessity of Episcopal Communion' (1743) are all controversial works, and are written not only with great ability, but in a courteous, gentlemanly — in fact, Christian — spirit

[1] A full list will be found in the article on 'Hickes, George,' in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

which it would have been well if many others had imitated.

Another friend of Hickes, Nathanael Spinckes, though he is generally regarded as a saint rather than a disputant, took a considerable part in the religious controversies of the day, writing in the same spirit in which Brett wrote. In 1705 he put forth a work entitled 'The Essay towards a Proposal for Catholic Communion answered Chapter by Chapter.' This was a reply to a Mr. Bissett, who proposed a reconciliation of the Church of England with the Church of Rome, and has a special interest as showing that a trusted leader of the Nonjurors whom many followed had no hope of a *concordat* between the two Churches. In 1714 he returned to the charge in a work entitled 'The Case fully stated,' &c.—that is, the case between the Church of England and the Church of Rome; and yet again, in 1718, in 'The Case farther stated between the Church of Rome and the Church of England, wherein the Chief Point about the Supremacy is fully discussed in a Dialogue between a Roman Catholic and a member of the Church of England.' He also entered the lists in 1705 against the 'French Prophets,' a set of enthusiasts claiming the spirit of prophecy, who had been driven from their home in the Cevennes, and found a refuge in England, where they anticipated some of those physical phenomena which marked the early Methodist movement. Spinckes's work was entitled 'The New Pretenders to Prophecy re-examined, and their Pretences shown to be Groundless and False.' In this crusade against the Camisard refugees, as they were called, Spinckes found himself in strange company; for not only did his friend Hickes write against them ('Enthusiasm Exorcised'), but also Hoadly, Whiston, Shaftesbury, and Calamy—a medley set.

Henry Dodwell also brought his vast stores of learning to bear upon subjects on which the Church of England was at variance with the Church of Rome on the one side and the various Protestant sects on the other; but most, if not all, of his writings on these subjects were earlier than the Nonjuring separation; after which he devoted himself either to questions connected with that separation or to general subjects.

It is not necessary, therefore, to dwell upon him, nor yet to do more than mention an able work by that learned man, Laurence Howell, on the Roman controversy, the title of which tells its own tale:

A View of the Pontificate: From its supposed Beginning to the End of the Council of Trent, A.D. 1563. In which the Corruptions of the Scriptures and Sacred Antiquity, Forgeries in the Councils, and Incroachments of the Court of Rome on the Church and State, to support their Infallibility, Supremacy, and other Modern Doctrines, are set in a true Light [1712].

Another edition appeared in 1716 under the less portentous title of 'The History of the Pontificate.'

But there is another controversial writer who cannot be dismissed so summarily. William Law, while yet a young and unknown man, only just turned thirty, leapt with a bound into fame by his 'Three Letters to the Bishop of Bangor,' the ablest of the voluminous writings on the Bangorian controversy. The Letters were published in 1717, and their reputation has gone on increasing rather than diminishing until the present day. But they have always been appreciated. Jones of Nayland described them as 'incomparable for truth of argument, brightness of wit, and purity of English.' Mr. F. D. Maurice thought that the 'Letters shewed the powers and temptations of a singularly able controversialist.'[1] The 'temptations' referred to were probably a tendency

[1] *Present Day Papers on Prominent Questions in Theology.*

to run riot in sarcasm and to indulge in extreme severity. Law is, no doubt, severe, and when he grew older he toned down considerably. But to a man of his opinions the provocation was strong, for the bishop glaringly set at defiance the most obvious principles of the Church in which he bore high office. Not less severe, and hardly less brilliant, is Law's next controversial work, which appeared in 1723. In 1714 Dr. Bernard Mandeville had published a poem entitled 'The Grumbling Hive, or Knaves turned Honest,' the gist of which was that when the bees turned honest they lost thereby their greatness and their wealth; and in 1723 he re-edited it, with notes, lest any one should miss the point. It was probably intended as a sort of satire on those who taught the rather grovelling doctrine of the morality of consequences, instead of the nobler one of the morality of principle. But the moral, at least on the surface, was that it answered better to be dishonest than honest, and Law was not the man to allow so dangerous a theory to pass without protest.

Law generally singled out strong antagonists; and as he chose the ablest of the Latitudinarians when he attacked Hoadly, so he chose the ablest of the Deists when he attacked Tindal, whose 'Christianity as old as the Creation' is the most powerful work Deism produced. Of course, in one sense, Law held as strongly as Tindal that Christianity was as old as the Creation; but what Tindal really meant was that natural religion rendered revealed religion unnecessary; in other words, he exalted reason at the expense of revelation. Against this theory Law published, in 1731–2, 'The Case of Reason, or Natural Religion fairly and fully stated in Answer to Christianity as Old as the Creation,' in which he anticipated some of the arguments in Bishop Butler's masterpiece of four years later.

Law's sacramental views were always high, and, so far from being lowered when he became a mystic, his mysticism only gave a fresh significance to them. Hence the first work which he wrote in his mystic stage was 'A Demonstration of the Gross and Fundamental Errors of a late Book called "A Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper"' (1737). The 'Plain Account' was published anonymously, but its writer was unquestionably Law's old foe, Bishop Hoadly, who practically reduced the Sacrament to a bare commemorative act. The author of the 'Plain Account' contended that 'the bare words of Christ in the institution of the Sacrament, interpreted according to the common rules of speaking in like cases, tell us all that can be known about the nature and effects of that Sacrament;' so that, argues Law, 'they would signify no more to him [a Christian] than they would to a heathen who had by chance found a bit of paper in the fields with the same words writ upon it.' He thinks that 'this author's contrivance is as unfit for the purpose as an iron key would be to open the gate of the kingdom of heaven.' Law was not wanting in raciness.

Two more controversial works of Law must be noticed: 'An Earnest and Serious Answer to Dr. Trapp's Discourse of the Folly, Sin and Danger of being Righteous Overmuch' (1740), and 'A Short but Sufficient Confutation of the Rev. Dr. Warburton's projected Defence (as he calls it) of Christianity'—that is, in 'The Divine Legation of Moses' (1757). Both are written in sorrow rather than in anger; it shocked Law as 'an enthusiast' that a brother clergyman who had been in a high position at Oxford, and was now a prominent divine in London,[1]

[1] Dr. Trapp was the first Professor of Poetry at Oxford, holding that office from 1708 to 1718; a fine portrait of him may be seen in the picture

should even *seem* to lower the high standard of morality which the literal interpretation of the Gospel, and especially of the Sermon on the Mount, obviously suggested; and it equally shocked him as 'a mystic,' who held that man was an emanation of the Deity, to think that another clergyman, who was on the high road to a bishopric, should believe that such a being was ever left in doubt about his eternal destiny.

It may appear strange that Law published nothing on the Roman controversy, for his 'Letters to a Lady Inclined to Enter the Church of Rome,' which were printed by an enthusiastic admirer nearly twenty years after his death, were never intended by him for publication; but the fact is that, though he had never the faintest inclination to join the Church of Rome, he was not so distinctly anti-Roman as most of the Nonjurors were. It may also appear strange that, though the Methodists were perpetually pointing out the deficiencies of Law, he never wrote one word in self-defence; for the slight tract 'Of Justification by Faith and Works: a Dialogue between a Methodist and a Churchman,' was really directed against Calvinism, not Methodism; but Law never wrote against men whom he regarded as spiritually-minded and earnest; they might say and write what they pleased about *him*; but he never took up his pen to write anything for publication against *them* 'lest haply he should be found to be fighting against God.'

(3) *Historical and Biographical Works.*

Taking the word 'history' in its proper sense of inquiry or investigation, and especially investigation into the past, it includes the most valuable part of all the

gallery of the Bodleian, and a copy of it in the hall of Wadham College, of which he was a member.

literary work done by the Nonjurors, viz. that which related to the early Church and the primitive Fathers. Professor J. J. Blunt, after having spoken of the discouraging effect of the Puritanism of the seventeenth century upon the study of such subjects, adds: 'But after awhile came the Revolution; an event which shed a much more disastrous influence on the taste for patristical learning, because a more enduring and insidious one than the Rebellion.' And then he expresses his opinion that 'the Nonjurors carried away with them that regard for primitive times which with them was destined by degrees almost to expire.'[1] Curiously enough, a Nonjuror, who took a very prominent part in the attempt to revive these studies, writing about thirty years after the Revolution, takes quite an opposite view. 'There seems,' writes Dr. Brett, 'at this time [1720], to be a general Inclination in Divines of the Church of England to enquire into Antiquities of the Christian Church, more than I am persuaded has been at any time since the Reformation'; and he expressly intimates that he is speaking 'not of Nonjurors only (who are now reduced to a very inconsiderable number), but those also who are of the publick communion of the Church of England.'[2] Which was right, Professor Blunt or Dr. Brett? The answer is a remarkable illustration of the difficulty a contemporary finds in judging the signs of his own times. Brett judged by what was going on when he wrote. He mentions especially 'Mr. Bingham and Mr. Johnson' of Cranbrook, and he probably thought also of Cave, Bull, Waterland, and others who were deeply interested in, and conversant with, antiquity. But Blunt could take a general survey and review the result from the vantage ground of a century; and experience shows

[1] *Lectures on the Right Use of the Fathers*, Lecture i. p. 18, *et seq.*
[2] Brett's *Collection of Liturgies*, p. 364.

that his view was correct, and that the hopeful anticipations of Brett were not fulfilled. The tone of mind introduced at the Revolution was quite antagonistic to any sympathetic study of antiquity. Men cannot throw themselves heart and soul into the study of phases of thought with which they are not in sympathy, and it was because Nonjurors were more in sympathy with the spirit of the early Church, not because they were more intelligent or more industrious, that patristic learning was found among them more than anywhere else in the eighteenth century. Dr. Hickes, their recognised leader, 'was a great master of ecclesiastical antiquities,' and did much to create an interest in the subject among his followers. His own contributions consist rather in the general spirit which pervades all his work, than in any great composition of his own on the subject, though, of course, his 'Constitution of the Catholick Church,' and Preface to 'Devotions in the Antient Way of Offices' bear directly upon it.

But Hickes's convert, Thomas Brett, really *did* produce a great work, which at the time was unique in its way, viz. 'A Collection of Liturgies used by the Primitive Church' (1720). It embraces eight Liturgies,[1] the Clementine, St. James's, St. Mark's, St. John Chrysostom's, St. Basil's, the Ethiopian, Nestorius', and Severius'. In his previous 'Account of Church Government' (1707), the subject is treated at large, and, in fact, in all his books he shows a deep interest in, and makes frequent references to, primitive antiquity.

Dr. Hickes also stamped with his approval, and probably suggested the writing of another very valuable and interesting book which is based upon primitive antiquity. The author, Archibald Campbell, was not, strictly speaking,

[1] It is perhaps needless to remark that 'Liturgy' is used in its ancient sense, as the Office of the Holy Eucharist.

an *English* Nonjuror, but he thoroughly identified himself with them, lived almost entirely among them, and brought out his book under the auspices of their head. It is commonly called 'Campbell's Middle State,' but its full title is:

> Some Primitive Doctrines Revived: or, The Intermediate or Middle State of Departed Souls (as to Happiness or Misery) Before the Day of Judgment, plainly prov'd by Holy Scripture and the Concurrent Testimony of the Fathers of the Church. To which is prefixed the Judgment of Dr. Hickes concerning the book and subject [1713].

Never perhaps was there a time when men's minds more required to be settled on the momentous but mysterious question of the Future State. It had been the subject of a most unsatisfactory discussion at the close of the seventeenth century in consequence of a sermon on 'The Eternity of Hell Torments,' by Archbishop Tillotson; and the result had been disastrous in every way to morals and religion. It was highly characteristic of the age that in that discussion no one appears to have gone back to primitive times; and the primitive doctrine of an Intermediate State seems to have fallen entirely into abeyance. It was revived by Bishop Campbell; but as he was a Nonjuror his book did not catch hold of the public mind. It was a sad pity that it did not; for I verily believe that the eschatology of the eighteenth century, combining as it did the utmost severity in theory with the utmost laxity in practice necessarily resulting from an only half belief, was one of the chief causes of the low estate into which morals and religion fell during that period. Campbell's tone, style, and method are all admirable, and there is a calmness and modesty about his work which make it very attractive. It is a book that might have done a world of good at the time, and its

republication would not be useless now. Dr. Hickes truly points out in his 'Judgment' that, 'so far from being Popish, there cannot be a more effectual Defensation against the Roman Heresy than a free and impartial Revival of Primitive Principles. To restore these, and consequently to foreclose the way among us against all Papal Innovations and Corruptions is the design of this book;' and the execution was equal to the design, but it was not the kind of work to appeal to the general public in the eighteenth century. In a fine passage Hickes describes what Campbell means by that middle state of which the vast majority of the public had probably never heard.

> His Middle State for the righteous is but as the Borders or Suburbs of Heaven or as the Bay and Entrance into that Blessed Kingdom, wherein they are very happy, but cannot yet attain their full happiness in the Presence or the Beatific Vision of God, till all their Brethren be perfected with them, and they can all receive their Crowns of Glory in that day.

By 'the righteous' he means 'all souls departed with the sign of faith.'

Another Nonjuror brought his knowledge of primitive antiquity to bear upon a question which much needed to be cleared up. It was this: In 1691 Peter King, afterwards Lord Chancellor, then a young man of twenty-two, who had been bred a Presbyterian, published anonymously the first part of a book with this ambitious title: 'An Enquiry into the Constitution, Discipline, Unity, and Worship of the Primitive Church that flourished within the first three hundred years of Christ. Faithfully collected out of the extant writings of those days.' The work was a remarkable performance, considering that the writer was a mere boy, who had had no particular advantages of education. It attracted the attention of John Locke, who was King's first cousin once

removed, and who virtually adopted him as his son. A sort of halo was shed over a book which was thus patronised by the most famous philosopher of the day; and this may have been one reason why it was not answered, for it clearly required answering. It was kindly and temperately written, but the impression it leaves is that Presbyterianism was the original form of Church government, or that no settled form could be gathered from Holy Scripture and primitive practice. But, strange to say, it remained unanswered for more than twenty years; and in 1713 King published another edition with a 'Second Part' added, treating of ceremonies and worship. Then at last the Nonjuring clergyman, William Sclater, with much diffidence and many apologies for his presumption (which were quite unnecessary), published anonymously, in 1717, a very able and exhaustive answer under the title of 'The Original Draught of the Primitive Church by a Presbyter of the Church of England.' In his very modest Preface Sclater gives us his reason for undertaking the task:

> In his Preface he [King] shews an humble diffidence of his youthful performance, and desires another sense might be given of his several quotations, if need required, for the better information of himself and others. I confess I saw need enough of that at my first perusal of the book, and not a little wondered that no friendly hand had done him that kindness long before.

So Sclater did it himself, and did it very well; his book quite bears out what we are told of the character of the writer, viz. that he was 'a man of singular modesty, of unaffected piety, and of uncommon learning.'[1] There is a pleasant story, which one fondly hopes may be true, but for which it must be owned that the evidence is not strong. It is said that Sclater's manuscript was seized

[1] See Lathbury's *History of the Nonjurors*, p. 302.

among other papers in the house of Spinckes, and was submitted to King, who returned it, confessing that it was a sufficient answer to that part of the book with which it dealt, and desiring that it might be published. At any rate, it is certain that King himself became a Churchman, and it is said that he then offered Sclater a living; but he did not become Lord Chancellor until after Sclater's death, and before then what living had he to offer? And if he did make the offer, Sclater, as a Nonjuror, could not have accepted it. 'The Original Draught' was republished at Oxford in 1840.

Laurence Howell's 'Synopsis Canonum' was another monumental illustration of the patient industry with which the Nonjurors investigated the history of the early Church. It appeared in three separate instalments, the first in 1708, 'A Synopsis of the Canons of the Holy Apostles and of the Councils, Ecumenical and Provincial, received by the Greek Church; also of the Councils, Decrees, and Laws of the British and Anglo-Saxon Churches; together with the Constitutions, as well Provincial (namely from Stephen Langton to Henry Chichele), as Legatine, &c., brought into a Compendium;' the second in 1710, 'A Synopsis of the Canons of the Latin Church and its Decrees; in which the spurious canons, forged Epistles, and supposititious decrees of that Church are brought to light and distinguished from the genuine.'[1] The third part did not appear until 1715, the reason of the long delay being that the manuscript was burnt in the fire at Bowyer's printing office in 1712;[2] and there is something plaintive in the author's announcement of it as 'being once more finished in 1715.'[3]

[1] These are literal translations of the Latin titles.

[2] See *supra*, p. 262.

[3] Howell had also another disappointment in regard to the Dedication. See Hearne's *Collections*, ii. 125.

The same year (1708) which saw the first instalment of Howell's 'Synopsis' saw also the first instalment of a still more important and popular work, 'Collier's Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain.' When it appeared it was unique; there was positively no other book in the English language which traversed the same ground, though of course many other authors had gone over parts of it; and to this day it is frequently quoted as an authority. Of course the writer, with his strong convictions, shows his colours; but, from his own point of view, he is wonderfully fair and trustworthy. The second volume appeared in 1714. Both were folios, and have been more than once reprinted in nine volumes, 8vo., with a life of the author prefixed. The best life is that written by Mr. Lathbury, the historian of the Nonjurors, who prefixed it to the edition of 1852. Strange to say, Mr. Collier's friends do not appear to have anticipated any great success for the work, although the writer had already shown his powers and won his reputation in several previous writings. But these writings were, with one exception, not strictly speaking historical. That exception was 'The Great Historical, Geographical, Genealogical, and Poetical Dictionary' (1701–5), which was not one of Collier's literary successes; and his friends seem to have argued from it that the Ecclesiastical History would also be a failure. Hearne speaks very disparagingly of the Dictionary, and augurs badly for the History.[1] But when the book came out, he is agreeably disappointed; so he adds a note to his first entry (i. 316): 'The work is since published, and is good;' and is quite enthusiastic about vol. ii., which gives him the additional satisfaction of anticipating that Collier will cut out the Whig Church historian, John Inett.[2] Curiously enough,

[1] See Hearne's *Collections*, i. 38, 316; ii. 35, 38. [2] *Ibid.* iii. 45–6.

Collier must have done just what Hearne prophesied he would *not* do, viz. 'search Records, &c.;' one of the great merits of his History is that it is based upon original authorities.

From Collier the historian to Carte the historian is a natural transition. It is a remarkable fact that the standard works, from the Church point of view, on the ecclesiastical and civil history of England should both have been written by Nonjurors; and the same merits characterise both. Carte, like Collier, strove his utmost to be fair all round; like Collier, he undertook original research before he presumed to write; and, like Collier, he was not ashamed to show his colours, and therefore, of course, provoked criticism. The project of his History was certainly formed as early as 1736—probably earlier—and the first volume did not appear until 1747; so he took time over his work, and spared no pains in investigation, searching, among other sources, the royal archives in Paris where much of the History was written. The encouragement, and, indeed, substantial aid, which he received in the execution of his task are very remarkable, considering that he was a known Jacobite, and was actually arrested and confined for a short time while the work was going on, owing to an alarm of a French invasion in support of a Jacobite rising in 1744. How little real matter of offence there was to the 'powers that be' in his first volume is shown by the fact that objection was taken merely to a note in which he expressed his faith in 'a cure for the king's evil wrought by the lineal descendant of a race of kings who had, indeed for a long succession of ages, cured that disease by the royal touch.' That note was sufficient to withdraw from his History the patronage of the English public, which was then in a most nervous alarm about the 'lineal descendant.' It was

a pity his friends did not persuade him to abstain from throwing down this apple of discord, as the cure took place at *Avignon*; and therefore the note was quite gratuitous, and might have been spared without at all affecting the History of England. Carte, however, was not discouraged, but went bravely on with and completed his book, the fourth and last volume appearing after his death. The work was better appreciated when the writer was no longer living, and therefore no longer dangerous, and when Jacobite alarms had become a thing of the past. It deserved to be welcomed warmly at least by one political party; for the Tory history of Carte is beyond all question the result of more diligent and original research than the rival Whig history of Rapin, which previously held the field; it was a nearer approach to the standard history of England, until Hume's work superseded both.

Among other Nonjurors who furnished contributions to our knowledge of Church history were Francis Brokesby, who wrote 'An History of the Government of the Primitive Church,' &c. (1712); Thomas Bedford, who edited the chronicler Simeon of Durham's 'History of the Church of Durham'; and George Smith, who, when only twenty-two years of age, took up his father's unfinished edition of 'Bede's Ecclesiastical History,' and completed it so successfully that it superseded all others, and was for a long time the standard edition; Mr. Plummer, the highest authority on the subject, speaks of it in terms of warm admiration. Nor must we forget the services rendered by Thomas Baker, who lavishly imparted information to Church historians, among others, out of his own ample stores; nor Thomas Hearne and Richard Rawlinson, who were ever collecting knowledge on this and kindred subjects with indefatigable labour.

The department of biography is in some respects

rather disappointing. Nelson's 'Life of Bishop Bull' seems to me the most satisfactory work of the kind written by a Nonjuror, unless it be the 'Life of Ambrose Bonwicke,' about which enough has been said. It looks like black ingratitude not to add Lee's 'Life of Kettlewell,' for there is no single work which gives more information about the earlier Nonjurors, and which has therefore been more largely drawn upon in the earlier part of the present work. But that is the very reason why it is not so satisfactory as a biography. It rambles too far afield, and does not concentrate attention sufficiently on Kettlewell. In fact, there is *no* good contemporary life *of* a Nonjuror *by* a Nonjuror, to our great loss. Brokesby's 'Life of Dodwell' is a very slight and unsatisfactory performance. Hickes's 'Life' was commenced by his friend, Hilkiah Bedford, to whom he left all his letters and papers, but it remained in an unfinished state in manuscript, having only reached the year 1689—just the time when the subject became most interesting. Collier also began to write an autobiography for the benefit of the 'Biographia Britannica,' but he again provokingly left off at the Revolution, just when *his* life also became most interesting. Hearne's autobiography, in spite of his friend Rawlinson's mean opinion of 'Tom's Life of Himself,' is about the best we possess, and his 'Diary' is, of course, invaluable. Byrom's 'Remains' are delightful, and so are Denis Granville's, but these are rather materials for biography than biographies; and the same may be said of Rawlinson's very valuable collections for his continuation of Wood's 'Athenæ Oxonienses.' Of complete biographies we have Brett's 'Life of John Johnson, of Cranbrook,' but this is merely a brief sketch, and Carte's 'Life of James, Duke of Ormonde' (1736), which certainly does not err on the

side of brevity, but rather lays itself open to Dr. Johnson's criticism: 'The matter is diffused in too many pages; there is no animation, no compression, no vigour. Two good volumes in duodecimo might be made out of two in folio.'[1] Thomas Smith's 'Vitæ quorundam eruditissimorum et illustrium virorum' was hardly for the general reader, and Hilkiah Bedford's 'Life of John Barwick' was only a translation. But Roger North's 'Lives of the Norths' and 'Examen' of White Kennett's History come under the present head, and are works of great interest and value, especially the former in its latest form under the able editorship of Dr. Jessopp.

(4) *Poetical Works.*

The age of the Nonjurors was not a poetical age, and the Nonjurors themselves did not sacrifice much to the Muses. The first who claims our attention in this connection is good Bishop Ken, who seems to have found it a relief to disburthen himself of his thoughts in verse; for though he wrote much he published nothing, with one exception; but then that exception is his one title to fame as a poet. Some may think that the posthumous publication of his epic, 'Edmund' ('Saint Edmund' would have been a more attractive and appropriate title), of his Dedications, his 'Anodynes,' his 'Hymnotheo,' and his 'Hymns for the Festivals of the Church' was a cruel kindness on the part of his friends; for if we had not seen what he *did*, we might have let fancy run riot in imagining what the man who published no verse except the three immortal hymns *might* have done. Even with regard to the three hymns themselves, his fame, as a matter of fact, rests only upon a few verses culled out of two of them.

[1] See Boswell's *Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides*, p. 236, in vol. v. of edition of *National Illustrated Library*.

Thousands who are perfectly familiar with about six stanzas of the Morning and the same number of the Evening Hymn are quite strangers to the rest, and know nothing at all about the Midnight Hymn. But the two hymns in common use (the verses omitted are unsuitable for psalmody) are, and always will be, *the* morning and evening hymns *par excellence*. Perhaps their extraordinary and well-deserved popularity has led to the undue depreciation of Ken's other poetry, in which depreciation the earlier biographers, not at all after the manner of biographers, lead the way. At all events, some very touching passages occur in these much-decried poems, among which the following may be quoted as having a biographical as well as a poetical interest:

> Give me the Priest these Graces shall possess:
> Of an Ambassador the just Address,
> A Father's Tenderness, a Shepherd's Care,
> A Leader's Courage, which the Cross can bear,
> A Ruler's Arm, a Watchman's wakeful Eye,
> A Pilot's Skill the Helm in Storms to ply,
> A Fisher's Patience and a Lab'rer's Toil,
> A Guide's Dexterity to disembroil,
> A Prophet's Inspiration from Above,
> A Teacher's Knowledge and a Saviour's Love.

And the 'Hymns for the Festivals of the Church' have at least one claim to our gratitude, if the story be true that they suggested to John Keble the idea of 'The Christian Year.'

Elijah Fenton was a Nonjuror who wrote poetry, just as his friend and patron, Alexander Pope, was a Roman Catholic who wrote poetry, but his poetry was no more connected with his mode of faith than Pope's was with his, so he only requires to be noticed just to show why he is *not* noticed.

The same cannot quite be said of that quasi-Nonjuror,

John Byrom, much of whose poetry was the reflection of his religion; it was, in fact, William Law in verse. And some who can read between the lines will find in such pieces as 'Christians, awake, salute the happy morn,' 'My Spirit longeth for Thee, or, The Christian's Address to his Soul,' 'Stones towards the earth descend,' traces of that refined mysticism which he had imbibed from Law.

The 'Divine Poems' of Walter Harte cannot, strictly speaking, be reckoned among Nonjuring literature, for the simple reason that the writer was not a Nonjuror; but they reflected the spirit of one who was. 'He had,' as Mr. Abbey says, 'been brought up among the best traditions of the Nonjurors,' and 'was a student and theologian of much the same type as his father,'[1] the Nonjuror already noticed.

The 'Devotions in the Antient Way of Offices,' edited by Dr. Hickes, contain a number of hymns, some of them of considerable merit. But so many had a hand in this work that it is impossible to say who was the composer of these hymns—probably not Dr. Hickes.

It will be seen that poetry formed a very small part of Nonjuring literature, and it is somewhat strange that this should be so, for the Nonjurors were, to a certain extent, identified with the Jacobites; and Jacobite songs and ballads, many of them of extreme beauty and pathos, abounded. But these formed no part of Nonjuring literature, and to touch upon them ever so slightly in this connection would be to foster a false notion, already too prevalent, that the Nonjurors were a political rather than a religious party; so I pass on at once to the next section.

[1] *English Church in the Eighteenth Century*, ii. 294–5. First Edition.

(5) *Miscellaneous Works.*

The literary work of the Nonjurors was so varied that a considerable part of it can only be grouped under this vague title. The most important book which comes under this head was what is commonly called 'Hickes' Thesaurus,' the proper title of which is 'Linguarum Veterum Septentrionalium Thesaurus, grammatico-criticus et archæologicus.' This 'stupendous monument of learning and industry,' as it has been called, was printed at Oxford by the University Press in 1703–5, and has been universally recognised as a monumental work. It was preceded in 1689 by a less ambitious but useful work on a kindred subject, 'An Anglo-Saxon and Mœso-Gothic Grammar.'

Those who think the Nonjurors were narrow-minded bigots, who had no interests beyond their own community, could not do better than read Jeremy Collier's 'Essays upon Moral Subjects' (1697) and his 'Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage' (1698), with the 'Defences,' 'Vindications,' &c., of it which followed. He will find that throughout them all, though Collier is always the priest, jealous for the privileges of his order which he rated very highly, he is priest of the Catholic Church, not of the Nonjuring body. It is dangerous to assert a negative, but I can remember no single passage in any of these writings which betrays the Nonjuror. They are simply the works of a religious, moral man, written in the general interests of religion and morality. It is a striking instance of the way in which a man can detach himself from his surroundings; for they were written just when Collier was in the very thick of the troubles into which his absolution of Sir John Perkins on the scaffold had not unnaturally brought

him. The 'Essays' were published in a collected form in 1697 (though some of them had appeared separately before then), and were on such general subjects as 'Pride,' 'Clothes,' 'Duelling,' &c. The most striking, perhaps, is that 'Upon the Office of a Chaplain,' which is a noble vindication of that much-abused office, and acquires an additional significance from the fact that Collier had himself acted in that capacity.

In the next year (1698) appeared his first attack on the drama, 'A Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage,' followed by numerous pamphlets in defence of his views. In writing these Collier showed an amount of moral courage which one cannot sufficiently admire. It was not so much that he must have known he would bring down to bear upon him, as he did, the batteries of all the wits; but he must also have known that he would be thought to be going against his own party; and it requires far greater moral courage to offend friends than enemies. For a Puritan like Prynne to attack the stage was natural enough; but for a Royalist of Royalists, a man who had pinned all his fortunes on the Stuart cause, to do so seemed like a Quixotic going out of the way to make enemies. But it was not so; public opinion went with him, simply because 'truth was great and prevailed.' Collier was by far the most effective assailant of the stage, but two other Nonjurors, Law and Bedford, followed in his wake. Dr. Johnson, who was for some reason rather prejudiced against the Nonjurors, does full justice to this crusade of Collier:

> I believe with no other motive than religious zeal and honest indignation . . . and with all his powers exalted and invigorated by just confidence in his cause . . . he walked out to battle, and assailed at once most of the living writers, from Dryden to D'Urfey. . . . The dispute was protracted through

ten years; but at last Comedy grew more modest: and Collier lived to see the reward of his labour in the reformation of the theatre.[1]

Under the head of 'Miscellaneous Works' must be placed Hearne's edition of 'The Itinerary of John Leland, the Antiquary,' published in nine volumes in 1710, and of the 'Collectanea' in six volumes in 1715, and it must be remembered that but for Hearne these works of the earliest of modern English antiquaries would probably never have seen the press; also Thomas Baker's 'Reflections on Learning,' the work by which the name of Baker is now best known, though it is certainly not the most valuable of his contributions to literature; his 'History of St. John's College,' which lay in manuscript for many years, is, even without the later additions of Cole, and the invaluable annotations of Professor J. E. B. Mayor, much more useful; also Edward Holdsworth's Latin poem, 'Muscipula,' written, as it was neatly remarked, 'with the purity of Virgil and the pleasantry of Lucian,' and his 'Remarks and Dissertations on Virgil,' published in 1768 by Joseph Spence; also Samuel Jebb's edition of Roger Bacon's 'Opus Majus,' and various classical, historical, and biographical works, though in these last three departments he has not attained a permanent fame; and the medical works of Paman and Sir Richard Jebb.

But it is impossible to describe in detail all the work done by Nonjurors as classical scholars, antiquaries, bibliophiles, numismatists, virtuosos, and cultivators of the fine arts. Henry Dodwell, Thomas Hearne, Thomas Smith, Thomas Baker, Richard Rawlinson, Thomas Rawlinson, Francis Cherry, Edward Holdsworth, Francis Brokesby, not to mention many others, were all men of

[1] Johnson's *Lives of the Poets*: 'Congreve,' ii. 191–2.

refined and cultivated tastes, and these tastes were not wholly unconnected with their position as Nonjurors. The same reverence for antiquity which made them relish such studies led them, in their religion, to prefer the old order of things to the new, and also helped to attach them to the old dynasty rather than the new. The early Hanoverians had no tastes of the sort themselves, and discouraged them in others. The Stuarts, with all their faults, were not wanting in this respect. They may have been hopeless as rulers, but they had the capacity for appreciating culture of various kinds which their successful rivals never had. Hence the age of the Stuarts, of which the Nonjurors were survivals, was an age of less grossness than that which is rather vaguely called the Georgian era; and among the incidental disasters resulting from the Nonjuring separation must be reckoned the loss thereby of an element which that coarse age could ill afford to dispense with.

CHAPTER X

THE NONJURORS IN SCOTLAND

THE history of the Nonjurors in Scotland is almost co-extensive with the history of the Scotch Episcopal Church for about a hundred years. Happily, however, in the present chapter it will not be necessary to undertake the ambitious task of writing a history of that Church from 1689 to 1789 in all its aspects; that has been done, and well done, by various Scotch Churchmen at various dates.[1] It will suffice for the present purpose to notice the Scotch Nonjurors *quâ* Nonjurors, ignoring the many other phases in which they may be regarded.

Both the Jacobite and the Nonjuring causes appealed much more strongly to Scottish than to English Church people for several reasons. The Stuarts were Scotchmen, and always looked upon Scotland as their native country. It was only natural that both the Old and the Young Chevalier should make Scotland, not England, the base of their operations for the recovery of their rights; for they knew that they had heartier and more numerous supporters among their own kith and kin than among the Southrons, and their supporters were, with very few

[1] See, *inter alia*, *An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, by John Skinner (1788); *History of the Scottish Episcopal Church*, &c., by John Parker Lawson (1843); *History of the Church of Scotland*, &c., by Thomas Stephen (1843–5); *Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, by George Grub (1861), the ablest and fullest of all. See also Dean Luckock's *The Church in Scotland* pp. 236–92.

exceptions, Episcopalians. Not only were they Episcopalians, as distinguished from Presbyterians, but they were Churchmen of a rather advanced type. When a small body, holding one set of opinions, is settled in the midst of a larger body, holding a different set, there is always a tendency in the smaller to emphasise their differences from the larger. Thus 'the Protestant Church' in Ireland, and the Huguenots in France, being in the midst of a Roman Catholic population, naturally became 'Low,' and the Scotch Episcopalians, being in the midst of a Presbyterian population, naturally became 'High,' and would on that account sympathise with the English Nonjurors, who were very distinctly High Churchmen. It must not be supposed, however, that the Nonjurors in England and the Nonjurors in Scotland were one body, for they were quite distinct communities; and when members of the one took part in the affairs of the other, as they frequently did on both sides, they were, strictly speaking, travelling outside their own province, and were acting *ultra vires*. And, once more, Scotland being farther removed from the chief scene of action did not feel so keenly nor anticipate so speedily the dangers from King James's government as those who were nearer its centre. William's invasion was projected and talked over in England some time before it was heard of in Scotland. It was not until a week or two before it took place that the rumour of it reached the Scotch; and the result was consternation on one side, elation on the other, but surprise on both. The tidings arrived in October 1688, and the Scotch Episcopalians seem to have committed themselves at once. The University of St. Andrews immediately prepared a loyal address to King James, which was signed by the archbishop (Dr. Arthur Ross) as Chancellor, all the Heads of colleges, and all the Professors,

testifying 'their adherence to the Christian principles of loyalty and obedience to their lawful sovereign, and dwelling gratefully on the constant liberality which the Stuarts had shown to their Church and University.'[1] The archbishop, having signed the address, hurried off to Edinburgh, where he found the bishops assembled; and on November 3 (two days before William's landing) 'a loyal and affectionate address'[2] was signed by twelve bishops, in which, having declared that they had been 'amazed to hear of an invasion from Holland,' they promised the King: 'As by the grace of God we shall preserve in ourselves a firm and unshaken loyalty, so we shall be zealous to promote in all your subjects an intemerable and steadfast allegiance to your Majesty, as an essential part of their religion, and of the glory of our holy profession.'[3] Thus, at a very early stage in the crisis, the Scotch bishops drew the sword and threw away the scabbard.

On the other side the extreme left of the Presbyterian party, the Cameronians, or 'hill-men,' who had mainly concentrated themselves in the western and south-western counties, without waiting to see what form of ecclesiastical government was to be established, took the law into their own hands, and commenced that course of armed interference commonly known as 'rabbling the curates.' The rabbled clergy in the diocese of Glasgow deputed their dean to go to London with a petition for protection to William, who issued a proclamation for keeping the peace in Scotland, but the rabblings went on worse than ever.

Meanwhile a more important deputation was being sent to London, the account of which sets before us most vividly the attitude which the majority of Scotch Episcopalians assumed in regard to the Nonjuring question.

[1] Stephen, iii. 341. [2] *Ibid.* iii. 342. [3] Skinner, ii. 513–4.

When they heard of the Prince's landing they determined to send two of their bishops to London 'with a renewal of their allegiance to King James, and to wait on the English bishops for advice and assistance in case that any unlucky thing might possibly happen to occur with respect to the Church.'[1] The two selected were the Bishop of Edinburgh (Dr. Alexander Rose) and the Bishop of Orkney (Dr. Andrew Bruce), but the latter fell ill, and Bishop Rose set forth alone. What befell him in that eventful expedition has been recorded by his own pen in a letter written at Bishop Archibald Campbell's request twenty-four years later (1713). He left Edinburgh under the impression that there would be no change of Government, and it was under that impression that his brother bishops commissioned him to act for them. So he found himself in a most awkward predicament, for, when he reached Northallerton, on his way southward, he heard that the Prince of Orange had assumed the government, and that James had fled. This altered the whole aspect of affairs, and he hesitated for some time as to what he should do.

> But [he writes], considering the various contradictory accounts I had all along the road, and that in case of the King's retirement matters would be much more dark and perplexed, I resolved to go on, that I might be able to send just accounts to my brethren from time to time, and have the advice of the English bishops whom I never doubted to find unalterably firm to their master's interest.

His first application was to Archbishop Sancroft, whom he had known before. He presented his commission, and the archbishop was sympathetic, but not encouraging. 'Matters,' he said, 'were very dark, and the cloud so thick or gross that they could not see through it; the

[1] Lawson, p. 39, quoted from Bishop Rose's Letter to Bishop A. Campbell.

English bishops knew not well what to do for themselves, far less what advice to give to others.' He then applied to the Bishop of St. Asaph (Dr. Lloyd), another acquaintance; but that, of course, was of no avail, for Lloyd's own sympathies were with the Revolution. Then he had recourse to the Bishop of London (Dr. Compton), begging him to 'use his influence with the Prince of Orange to protect the Episcopal clergy in Scotland'; and also to his own countryman, Bishop Burnet, for the same purpose. The latter at once cut him short, saying that 'he did not meddle in Scots' affairs'—a somewhat audacious assertion on the part of one who was the most meddlesome of men. But Bishop Compton was much more kind and considerate, and advised him 'to wait on the Prince and present him with an address respecting the treatment of the clergy in Scotland.' Several Scottish peers also gave him the same advice.

> I asked [proceeds Bishop Rose] whether I or my address would meet with acceptance or success if it did not compliment the Prince upon his descent to deliver us from Popery and slavery? They said that it was absolutely necessary. I told them that I neither was instructed by my constituents to do so, neither had I myself clearness to do it, and that in these terms I neither could nor would visit or address his Highness.

Matters seemed now to be at a deadlock. The bishop had several interviews with Archbishop Sancroft and Bishop Turner, who, of course, thoroughly sympathised with him, but could give him no help; and so, finding that nothing more could be done, he prepared to return to Scotland, but found that he could not safely do so without a pass from the Prince. He once more applied to Bishop Compton, who, though he had no sympathy with Nonjuring principles, seems to have been most kind

throughout; and Compton strove to procure an interview with William for Bishop Rose, Sir George Mackenzie, and other friends of the Scotch Episcopate on the subject of the persecuted clergy. William replied that he could not admit either Episcopalians or Presbyterians in a body, because to do so would be sure to give offence to the other party; he could not allow more than two of either party at a time to speak to him of Scotch ecclesiastical affairs. Upon this Bishop Compton said to Bishop Rose:

You see, my Lord, that the king having thrown himself upon the water must keep himself a swimming with one hand. The Presbyterians have joined him closely and offer to support him, and therefore he cannot cast them off, unless he could see how otherwise he can be served. And he bids me tell you, that he now knows the state of Scotland much better than he did when he was in Holland: For while there, he was made to believe that Scotland generally all over was Presbyterian; but now he sees that the great body of nobility and gentry are for Episcopacy, and it is the trading and inferior sort that are for Presbytery; therefore he bids me tell you that if you will undertake to serve him, to the purpose that he is served here in England, he will take you by the hand, support the Church and order, and throw off the Presbyterians.

Bishop Rose replied:

My Lord, I cannot but humbly thank the Prince for this frankness and offer; but withal I must tell your Lordship that when I came from Scotland neither my brethren nor I apprehended any such revolution as I have now seen in England; and therefore I neither was nor could be instructed by them what answer to make to the Prince's offer: And therefore what I say is not in their name, but only my own private opinion, which is, that I truly think they will not serve the Prince so as he is served in England; that is, as I take it, to make him their king, or give their suffrages for his being king. And though as to this matter I can say nothing in their name, and as from them, yet for myself I must say, that rather than do so I will abandon all the interest that either I have, or may expect to have in Britain.

As Bishop Compton was replying William passed through the room, and took no notice of the bishops; but Compton procured for Rose an audience on the next day, at which William said, 'My Lord, are you going for Scotland?' 'Yes, sir,' replied the bishop, 'if you have any commands for me.' 'I hope,' said the King, 'you will be kind to me, and follow the example of England.' 'Sir,' replied the bishop, 'I will serve you so far as law, reason, or conscience shall allow me.' William instantly turned in silence from the bishop, who retired and returned to Scotland *re infectâ*.

This memorable incident has been described at some length because on it the fate of the Church appears to have hung. Bishop Rose has been severely blamed for having mismanaged the matter. Episcopacy might have been established in Scotland if he had been the man to cope with the crisis; he himself thinks 'the king would probably have protected them if they had come into his interest,' and the Presbyterian historian, Dr. Cook, admits that

> William wished to continue the Episcopal Church as the National Establishment; he thought it desirable that the same form of Church government should be established through the whole of Britain; and if the Episcopal party had now cordially joined him, and consented to admit modifications of Episcopacy, to include within the pale of the Establishment those who otherwise would not have entered it, there is little doubt that he would have earnestly contended for the continuance of the Hierarchy.[1]

But it must be remembered that those whom Bishop Rose represented were all uncompromising Jacobites, and he would have utterly betrayed them if he had acted otherwise than he did.

John Skinner, who lived not very far from the time

[1] Quoted by Lawson, p. 98.

of the events and had seen both sides, having been brought up as a Presbyterian and then become an Episcopalian and a sufferer in the cause of the Church, was perfectly satisfied with the conduct of the bishops in general and of Bishop Rose in particular.

The case [he writes] of the Church of England at this period of confusion (1691) was fully as disagreeable as our own, if not more so. In Scotland the established Episcopacy was struck down at one blow, and its rival Presbytery set up in its room, without offering members of the old constitution any conditions, or giving them time to deliberate what side of the political question to espouse. So that the Scottish bishops, being all involved in one general catastrophe, and not being divided by any insnaring alternatives, had no difficulty to maintain the Episcopal cause, and to support the interest of the Church by purely ecclesiastical arguments, and upon her own original and independent bottom. In England the face of the old constitution was preserved, and by the appointment of the new legislature Episcopacy was made to fight against itself. This was an intricate and unwelcome combat, and the Bishops who had the injured side to defend, being reduced to the necessity of defending one form of Protestant Episcopacy against another, were many times obliged to fly off to foreign assistance and bring forward arguments which were in good measure extraneous to the main cause; while the Bishops in Scotland had nothing to do but combat their adversaries with weapons which every Episcopal Church had taken out of the storehouse of pure and uncorrupted antiquity, before political discussions had come to be blended with Church censures. The truth of this observation will appear from all the controversial disputes of those days, where it is easy to see that many of the weightiest objections against the English separations do not affect the Episcopacy of Scotland; while, on the other hand, every defence that the ejected succession in England could make for themselves is applicable to the Scottish cause with equal propriety and force.[1]

[1] *An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, by John Skinner, ii. 580–1. John Skinner was minister of Longside, in Aberdeenshire, for no less than sixty-five years (1742–1807), and was father of the Bishop of Aberdeen, who published his father's *Theological Works*, with a biography prefixed.

The writer of these weighty words evidently thought that Establishment might be purchased at too dear a rate, and by no means regretted that Bishop Rose's visit to England had been a failure. And one can well see what his point of view was. The complications to which he referred in England would have been ten times greater in Scotland. The gulf between the Presbyterians and Episcopalians was far too wide to be bridged over by any such 'modifications' as Dr. Cook suggests. It was not only the oaths that blocked the way, though these were to many an insuperable obstacle; but the general spirit and tone of mind of the Presbyterians, who formed the majority, though by no means so large a majority as was represented, made any sort of compromise at that time an impossibility.[1] A comprehension, indeed, was attempted for a short time, but it was a melancholy failure. Those clergy who were willing to take the oaths were allowed to retain their livings and to bear a part in Church government,[2] and for a while there was the

strange sight of a Protestant National Church which could strictly be called neither Presbyterian nor Episcopalian, but a heterogeneous compound of two jarring denominations, both of them publicly acknowledged to be Ministers of the Gospel, invested with the pastoral charge, and formally confirmed by the then legal authority, but neither of them in full terms of communion, nor agreeing in many points of worship.[3]

But all the bishops and a great majority of the clergy held aloof, suffered quietly, and were content to exercise their ministry so far as they were allowed to do

[1] See Lawson, p. 105 *et seq.*, and Skinner, ii. 559–60. As one reads of what was said and done in the Scotch Parliament and the General Assembly, it really seems as if the clock were put back fifty years, and we were at the close of the first, not of the second half of the seventeenth century.

[2] But much to the disgust of the Assembly, which soon got rid of them. See Skinner, ii. 583 *et seq.*

[3] Skinner, ii. 591.

so. These and their congregations were the Scottish Nonjurors, and it is with them, and them alone, that the present work has to do. Of course the oracle was worked against them in regard to the oaths, and one privilege after another was taken away from them; but, like their brethren in England, they submitted patiently, and gave little or no trouble to the Government.

The accession of Queen Anne afforded the Nonjurors, at least indirectly, some relief. The new Queen, being herself a Churchwoman by conviction, naturally viewed them with more favourable eyes; and they, on their part, were ready to accept her as a sort of regent for her brother. In 1703 the clergy presented to her an address beseeching her to allow 'such parishes where Episcopalians were in the majority to be held by Episcopally ordained ministers;' they reminded her that 'the petitioners had been violently and unjustly turned out of their charges at the Revolution,' and entreated 'her Majesty to compassionate them and their numerous families, who were reduced to a starving condition for their adhering to the true primitive and apostolic Church of which her Majesty was a member.' The appeal was not without effect. No actual grant of toleration was made as yet; but the clergy took heart of grace; some now acknowledged the Government who had not acknowledged it before; more numerous and regular services were held in the larger places, at which the Queen was prayed for by name; and though the Nonjurors—among whom were all the surviving bishops—could not do this, they tacitly assumed that they might with safety conduct their services more openly than before; and the Queen was so far from being offended that she allowed a pension out of the bishop's rents to Bishop Rose, the head of the Nonjurors, which was paid to him regularly until 1716.

Matters ran smoothly so far as outward opposition went until 1707, when the Nonjurors received another check. 1707 was the year of the Union,[1] a project which was unpopular among all classes in Scotland; and in order to conciliate the Presbyterians to the hated measure, orders were issued to shut up 'all Episcopal meeting-houses without distinction.' It was a cruel order, for those who suffered from it were not in the least to blame; but, true to their principles, they quietly submitted; the 'meeting-houses' were closed, and the clergy retired without a murmur into domestic life, confining their ministry to private offices.

The invasion from France in favour of the Stuarts in 1708 increased the suspicions against the Nonjurors in Scotland as elsewhere; and hence it was not until 1712 that a Toleration Act was passed in the now United Parliament, which gave the Episcopalians in Scotland legal protection, and not merely connivance. But even this Act did not cover the Nonjurors, who formed the large majority of the Church; for, though it was described generally as 'An Act to prevent the disturbing those of the Episcopal Communion in the exercise of their religious worship, and in the use of the Liturgy of the Church of England; and for repealing the Act of the Parliament of Scotland against irregular Baptisms and Marriages' (that is, the Act of 1695), it was carefully provided that before any clergyman could enjoy the benefit of it he should produce his Letters of Orders before a Justice of Peace at Quarter Sessions, and subscribe, not only the oath of Allegiance, but also those of Assurance[2]

[1] The Act was passed in 1706, and is dated from that year; but it did not come into effect until 1707.

[2] The Assurance ran: 'I do assent, acknowledge and declare that her Majesty is the only lawful and undoubted Sovereign as well *de jure* as *de facto*;' it thus went beyond the simple oath of Allegiance.

and Abjuration, and that every time he officiated in a protected place of worship he must pray for the Queen, the Princess Sophia, and the rest of the Royal Family—conditions with which of course no conscientious Nonjurors could comply. It afforded them, therefore, no direct relief; on the contrary, it supplied subsequently the most convenient means of proceeding against them. Indirectly, however, the general spirit of leniency towards the Church shown in this Act, and in the Patronage Act [1] which followed, encouraged the Nonjuring as well as the complying clergy to resume their public functions; and they were tacitly permitted to do so during the remainder of Queen Anne's reign.

The accession of George I. in 1714 produced a change of feeling even before the rising in 1715. The Scottish Nonjurors had always abhorred the thought of the Hanoverian Succession from the time of the Act of Settlement in 1700; and the proclamation that was issued, as soon as that succession became an accomplished fact, for putting the laws into execution against 'all Papists, Nonjurors, and disaffected persons' confirmed their abhorrence. They had fondly hoped that, after the 'regency' of Queen Anne, her brother would succeed—a hope which was shared by many Englishmen. But when this hope was rudely shattered by the unopposed accession of King George, the disappointment was more bitter in Scotland than it was in England, partly because the Stuart claimant was himself a Scotchman and connected with Scotland by many ties, partly because the Scotch Episcopal Church suffered more severely by the change than her English sister; for in the former a large majority, in the latter only a small minority, were Nonjurors. It

[1] That is the Act to restore to the patrons their ancient rights of presenting ministers to the churches vacant in Scotland.

is not surprising, therefore, that a number of Scotch Nonjurors showed a warm and active sympathy with the insurgents in 1715 :

> Previously [writes Mr. Grub] it cannot be said that the Church, as a body, had openly supported the House of Stuart. A considerable number of clergy and laity had taken the oaths, and remained firm in their allegiance to William and Anne. And though the opinions of the Nonjurors necessarily implied a belief in the unlawfulness of the Revolution Settlement, it did not follow that they held active opposition to it allowable. Now it was different. The disappointment of their hopes, ecclesiastical and political, on the accession of George I., and the certainty that a peaceful restoration of the ancient line was no longer possible, united almost all friends of the hierarchy in attachment to James.[1]

Some Nonjuring clergy, including bishops, openly identified themselves with the rising, and when the catastrophe came the victors were not disposed to temper justice with mercy in their treatment of those who had so manifestly aided the vanquished party. In 1716 the oaths were everywhere put to the clergy, and the strictest orders were given to them to pray for the reigning sovereign. The result was a great increase in the number of avowed Nonjurors, who were certainly treated with great severity. There was no need of new laws to proceed against them ; for, oddly enough, the very Act which had been passed for the relief of the Episcopalians in 1712 was quite sufficient to cover the ejection of many of them in 1716, requiring, as it did, the oaths to be taken and the ruling powers to be prayed for by name. All that had to be done was to enforce it rigorously, and not to wink at the evasions of it which had been frequent in the reign of Queen Anne. Accordingly, on May 21 the King wrote to the Lords Justiciary that he heard there were meeting-

[1] *An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, by George Grub, iii. 373.

houses in Edinburgh and other parts of Scotland where divine service was performed without praying for himself and the Royal Family, and requiring them to give strict orders for shutting up such meeting-houses and proceeding against the offenders.[1] The judges replied that they would order prosecutions against such offenders, but were 'humbly of opinion that they could not shut up meeting-houses till after trial and conviction by due course of law.'[2] It was, however, easy enough to make out a case against the clergy. The Indemnity Act of 1717–8 gave them a little relief, and they were again permitted to carry on their functions publicly. But in 1719 a severe law was enacted which seemed likely to render their case more hopeless than ever. Its avowed object was 'to make more effectual the laws appointing oaths for the security of the government to be taken by ministers of churches and meeting-houses within Scotland.' It provided that

> every episcopal minister performing any divine service without having taken the oaths in the terms of Queen Anne's Toleration, and praying for the King and royal family, is to suffer six months' imprisonment, and have his meeting-house shut up for six months; and every house where nine or more persons, besides the family, are present at divine service is declared to be a meeting-house within the meaning of the Act.[3]

But, strange to say, the very year of the passing of this rigorous Act is also the year from which is dated the commencement of much quieter times for the Church. For the next twenty-seven years—that is, from 1719 to 1746—she enjoyed an outward peace and prosperity such as she had never enjoyed since the Revolution, and which

[1] *History of the Scottish Episcopal Church*, by John Parker Lawson, pp. 218–9.

[2] *History of the Church of Scotland*, by Thomas Stephen, iii. 127.

[3] Skinner, ii. 620.

she was not to enjoy again until nearly half a century after the last Jacobite rising of 1745. The explanation may be found partly in the fact that the alarm about 'the Pretender' gradually subsided, and partly in the quiet and inoffensive behaviour of the Church itself, which showed that it was more interested in ecclesiastical than in political affairs, and that it was not likely to be seriously dangerous to the ruling powers. Hence, though the Act of 1719 remained on the Statute Book, it was not severely enforced, and no future measures were taken which need here be noticed until we come to the famous '45.' We may now, therefore, turn to the internal history of the Scotch Nonjurors.

From 1689 to 1720 A.D., amidst all the troubles they suffered from without, the Scotch Nonjurors enjoyed perfect peace and harmony among themselves. Perhaps the very fact that they had so many and so strong enemies outside the fold drew them closer together; they could not afford the luxury of internal disputes under such circumstances. But they were also largely indebted for their internal peace to the good judgment, reasonableness, and administrative ability of *Alexander Rose* (1647–1720), Bishop of Edinburgh, whose futile mission to London in 1689 has been already described. His conduct on that occasion has been blamed, and so also has his general administration of the Church; but, on the other hand, it has been most enthusiastically praised. It is not difficult to see the reason of the differences in the estimates of this very prominent man: what some would call wise caution and prudence in him others would call timidity; and, on the other hand, what some would call firmness

others would term obstinacy. But let us turn to facts, from which the reader may form his own estimate.

In 1704 Arthur Ross, 'Archbishop of St. Andrews and Primate of the Church in Scotland,' died; the archbishopric was not filled up, but his position as primate was more than filled by his nephew Alexander, the son of his elder brother. Ross and Rose are the same name; and the latter was always called Bishop Rose, not Bishop Ross. Perhaps this was in order to distinguish him from his uncle; but the change has rather tended to produce confusion. He was known to the end as Bishop of Edinburgh; but he also describes himself in an official document as 'Vicar-General of St. Andrews.'[1] In the language of Mr. Grub,

> he was not only Primate and Metropolitan, but, so far as jurisdiction was concerned, Bishop of the whole Church—Episcopus Scotorum. The influence which his station gave him was increased by his ability and virtues; and in his later years, he had an ecclesiastical authority in his own communion, unlike anything that had been known in Scotland since the time of the first successors of S. Columba.[2]

His personal qualifications were those which were most needed in a leader of men who were in the position of the Scotch Nonjurors. Such men would be sorely tempted to sink the ecclesiastic in the politician, to adopt wild and extravagant notions in sheer reaction from their surroundings, and to become bigoted and narrow-minded. But their leader, though an uncompromising Jacobite, never forgot that he was the clergyman first and foremost, and the politician only in quite the second place. Bishop Rose's name never occurs in connection with any of the

[1] 'Sedis Sancti Andreæ nunc vacantis vicarii,' is his description of himself in the deed of Bishop Sage's consecration.

[2] *Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, by George Grub, iii. 352.

risings, actual or projected, in favour of the Stuarts; he was always calm and collected, cautious and sober in his judgments, and very conciliatory, without being in the least degree a trimmer. In 1710, when there appeared likely to be a *rapprochement* between the Churches of England and Scotland under the fostering care of Queen Anne, he received a letter from Oxford asking 'whether he and the rest of the Scotch bishops were in communion, as matters now stood, with the Established Church of England and her bishops?' Now, this was a very delicate question, and an injudicious answer to it might easily have dashed the vessel of which Bishop Rose was the helmsman against either Scylla or Charybdis. On the one hand, it would certainly not be wise for the weak and suffering Church in Scotland to reject any overtures which she could conscientiously accept from her more powerful sister across the border. On the other hand, it would be worse than unwise to commit her to principles and courses of action which she would be quite sure, sooner or later, to repudiate; for, though she was not quite in the same position as the Nonjuring 'remnant' in England, still less was she in full sympathy with what was called 'the Revolution Church.' Bishop Rose, however, steered safely between the two rocks; his answer is a model of courtesy and caution. Having touched gently the political question,

> I know [he wrote] there has been a division among members of the Church of England on that head. The controversy is great and national, and our circumstances among ourselves not affording such difficulties, the most of us, perchance, have not so carefully examined that matter, and want needful help to be instructed fully in it;

he cannot give his own sense without consulting his brethren.[1]

[1] See Stephen's *History of the Church of Scotland*, iv. 57.

Again, when the 'Usages controversy' broke out in England, some of the English Nonjurors strove to involve the Scotch Nonjurors in it; but Bishop Rose kept them out of the snare, into which they fell immediately after his death. He himself had strong opinions on the subject, and they were, more or less, on the side of the Usagers; but he saw that for his own Church the question must be settled on its own merits, and must not be complicated by English difficulties which had no existence on the Scotch side of the border.

On the other hand, Bishop Rose was more in touch than his brethren with eminent Churchmen, who were not Nonjurors, on the English side. He kept up a correspondence with John Sharp, Archbishop of York, and Henry Compton, Bishop of London, both of them his old friends. The former was a firm and powerful friend at Court of the Scotch Episcopal Church;[1] the latter had, as we have seen, backed Rose up in his attempt in 1689, and 'always retained a particular esteem for him;'[2] and it was through Rose's influence that the English Liturgy began to be used in Aberdeen, St. Andrews, and other places.[3] This connection with men in England, who did not agree with him on all points, enabled him to realise that most questions might be viewed from another standpoint than his own, and served to dispel any narrowness which the peculiar position of the Scotch Nonjurors might have a tendency to foster.

On the other hand, his great influence naturally created alarm in the minds of those Englishmen who were most hostile to Nonjuring principles. There is a curious letter from Bishop Nicolson, of Carlisle, to Archbishop Wake which illustrates this. Bishop Nicolson's alarm at

[1] See *Life of Archbishop John Sharp*, by his Son, ii. 63, and *passim*.
[2] Stephen, iv. 57.
[3] Skinner, ii. 605.

the spread of Nonjuring principles in London has been already noticed.[1] But as bishop of a border diocese he would naturally be still more alarmed at their spread in the Lowlands of Scotland. So he appears to have sent his chaplain on a sort of reconnoitring expedition, and on his return wrote to the English Primate in 1710: 'The greatest number of the Episcopalians are under the direction and influence of the exauctorate Bishop of Edinburgh, who is entirely in the interest of the Pretender, and will allow none of his followers to pray for the Queen, though himself owns her title in the receipts he gives for his pension,' &c.

Bishop Rose was in a peculiar position. On the death of the last Archbishop of Glasgow, Dr. Arthur Ross, in 1704, there were only five bishops surviving, and it was thought desirable to consecrate others in order to prevent the possibility of the succession dying out. But here a difficulty occurred. The Scotch Nonjurors, like their brethren in England, were most anxious to do everything in so important a matter in a constitutional way, and they thought that a bishop with full powers could not be constitutionally appointed without a nomination from the sovereign, and a *congé d'élire* issued by him to the dean and chapter of the diocese to elect the nominee. But then there was neither sovereign, nor dean, nor chapter available. Hence arose that curious and unchurchlike plan of appointing 'bishops at large,' which afterwards caused great confusion and dissension in the Church. It was agreed that 'during the life of any of the old bishops the government of the Church should remain entirely in their hands, and that the newly consecrated should be vested with no diocesan power, but merely keep up the order, and give their counsel and concurrence when called

[1] See *supra*, p. 282.

for.'[1] This arrangement contributed greatly to the dominant position of Bishop Rose, for he was the last survivor of the old bishops, and was therefore associated with bishops who had no episcopal jurisdiction. The first two who were selected for this shadowy honour, and were co-opted by the bishops themselves into their body, were John Fullarton and John Sage, who, on St. Paul's Day 1705, were consecrated privately at Edinburgh by the Archbishop of Glasgow (John Paterson), the Bishop of Edinburgh (Alexander Rose), and the Bishop of Dunblane (Robert Douglas).

Of Bishop Fullarton it is not necessary to say more than that he was an eminently respectable prelate, and that he became, in 1720, a not unworthy successor, even of Rose, as Bishop of Edinburgh and Primus, though he was not granted the vicarious powers which Rose had exercised as vicar-general in the province of St. Andrews;[2] but the bishop consecrated with him requires a more detailed notice.

John Sage (1652–1711) may be regarded as a sort of *protégé* of Bishop Rose, though he far surpassed his patron in literary eminence. He was of an old Royalist stock, his father having been a captain in the Royal army during the Civil War, and he was faithful to the family traditions. Having graduated at St. Andrews, he acted for some time as a parish schoolmaster, and then became tutor and chaplain in the family of James Drummond, in Perthshire. While residing with his pupils at Perth he made the acquaintance of Alexander Rose, who was at that time a minister in the Old Church of that city. In 1683 Rose removed to Glasgow, where Sage visited him in 1684. Rose introduced him to his uncle, then Archbishop of Glasgow, who ordained him in 1685, and insti-

[1] Skinner, ii. 602–3. [2] Lawson, p. 224.

tuted him to a charge in Glasgow, where, it is said, he 'was universally respected.'[1] This was, perhaps, the reason why he was less severely treated than most of the 'rabbled' clergy in that city and diocese. He suffered, however, quite enough for conscience' sake; he was driven from the city by the Cameronians, and had to retire to Edinburgh. He was also prevented from accepting another favour from his kind friend, the archbishop, who in 1688 nominated him to the divinity chair at St. Andrews, a post for which he was eminently qualified. He remained quietly at Edinburgh for some years, but not in idleness, for he was very busy with his pen, and appears also to have taken part in Nonjuring services, for in 1693 he was 'banished from Edinburgh by the Privy Council for officiating as a Nonjuror.' He then found refuge in the houses of several Jacobite gentry until his consecration in 1705. He was not allowed, however, to do much work as a bishop, for in 1706 he was stricken with paralysis, from which he never fully recovered. He spent a year in London and then returned to Edinburgh, where he died, June 7, 1711. Sage rendered great service to his Church in a direction in which it was needed. Although the Scotch Nonjurors were, as a body, men of culture, and some of them of intellectual eminence, they were not so productive of literary work as their English brethren. But Sage was an exception. To his powerful pen we owe some of the most racy and vivid sketches of the sufferings of the Scotch clergy, and some of the most weighty vindications of their Church principles which we possess. Indeed, almost all his writings, which are fairly numerous, are, directly or indirectly, concerned with the Scotch Episcopal Church. Perhaps the best known and most valuable is

[1] Lawson, p. 181.

'The Principles of the Cyprianic Age' (1695), for it has more general interest than his writings on the controversies of his own day in Scotland have. Without being abusive, he is certainly a severe writer, and one can well understand how he would die 'lamented by his friends and feared by his adversaries.'[1] His biography has been written by another Scotch bishop, John Gillan, of Dunblane, himself a man of great learning, and his works have been published in three volumes, with a memoir prefixed, by the Spottiswoode Society.

The course of appointing bishops without sees was continued, and in 1709 John Falconer and Henry Christie were consecrated by Bishops Rose, Douglas, and Sage on those terms. The latter does not require any particular notice, but the former does.

John Falconer (d. 1723) has been well described as 'not only a man of great piety and prudence, but likewise a consummate divine, and deeply versed in the doctrines and rites of the Primitive Church, which, both by example and argument, he studied to revive and bring again into practice in the softest and most inoffensive manner possible.'[2] All his conduct answers to this description. The trusted friend of Bishop Rose, who pressed him 'to take the burden of the Episcopate,' he was more distinctly, or perhaps, one should say, more exclusively, the Churchman than Rose was. Though the most modest and gentle of men, he knew exactly what he meant, and pressed his point, generally with success; perhaps his social influence, for he was connected by both birth and marriage with the highest families, helped him. It was Bishop Falconer who, more than any other, was instrumental in restoring the apostolic rite of confirmation, which, strange to say, had fallen into abeyance in the

[1] Lawson, p. 185. [2] Quoted by Lawson, p. 189.

Scotch Church; Bishop Falconer, who was foremost in opposing the novel plan of consecrating bishops merely to keep up the succession, without any diocesan jurisdiction. Though a Nonjuror and a Jacobite, he resisted the too successful attempts which were made to use the Church merely as an instrument for restoring the exiled family; and he protested against his brother clergy's opposition to the revival of 'obsolete usages': he thought they were sanctioned by the Primitive Church, and that their restoration was 'most desirable.' He carried all these points, and that without giving offence to any.[1]

In 1711 another consecration of a bishop at large took place—viz. that of *Archibald Campbell*, whose *magnum opus* has been already noticed in the chapter on the general literature of the Nonjurors.[2] In fact, one scarcely knows whether to place Campbell among the English or the Scotch Nonjurors. On the one hand, he was a Scotchman by birth and education; he received Holy Orders in the Scotch Church, and was consecrated a bishop in it at Dundee on the Feast of St. Bartholomew, 1711, by Bishops Rose, Douglas, and Falconer. But, on the other hand, he lived almost entirely in London, not only before, but after, his consecration, and even after he was elected in 1721 a diocesan bishop by the clergy of Aberdeen. Indeed, it is said that he never once visited his diocese, except vicariously, through his friend and 'vicar,' Gadderar;[3] and he died in London in 1744. He was

[1] A most interesting series of articles entitled 'Bishop John Falconer and his Friends' appeared in the *Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal*, vols. ii. and iii. (1855). It is an open secret that these articles were written by the late Canon William Bright. I am indebted to the present Bishop of Edinburgh (Dr. Dowden) for directing my attention to them. Bishop Falconer's Christian name is inserted to distinguish him from *William* Falconer, who 'held the highest office in the Episcopal Church of Scotland for forty-three years'—that is, from 1741 to 1784.

[2] See *supra*, p. 402–4.

[3] Stephen, iv. 165.

far more intimately associated with the English than with the Scotch Nonjurors; he helped to consecrate four of their *regular* bishops, and started, as we have seen, an *ir*regular line of his own—still in England. But he did not forget his nationality, and it is said that one of the reasons why he made England his permanent home was that in that richer country he could better obtain pecuniary help for his own poor, distressed Church, in which charitable work he was not a little aided by the fact that he was the scion of a noble family on both sides. And this leads one to ask, 'What was he doing in that Galley, full of Jacobites and Nonjurors, at all?' For his father was Lord Niel Campbell, a son of that Marquis of Argyll who was executed under a Stuart in 1661; and his mother (*née* Lady Vere Ker) was sister of that Earl of Lothian who held high office under William III. after the Revolution. Dr. Johnson tells us that he learnt abroad to 'keep better company' than the Whigs, with whom he had been brought up, referring to the fact that he made his escape to Surinam after the failure of the Monmouth rebellion, in which he had taken part. It is a question into which it would be foreign to this work to enter in detail; it is enough to say that for the greater part of his long life he was a strong Jacobite and Nonjuror.[1]

With the name of Archibald Campbell one naturally associates that of *James Gadderar* (1655–1733), for, if such an expression may be used about dignified prelates, the two ran in couples, and both formed a sort of connecting link between the English and the Scotch Nonjurors. Gadderar was one of the 'rabbled' clergy in 1688. Then he settled in London, and resided there for many years. In 1703 he published a translation of the Latin work of the famous lawyer, Sir Thomas Craig,

[1] See *Lockhart Papers*, ii. 99–102.

'Treatise on the Right of James VI. to the Succession to the English Crown,' written about a hundred years before, but not published. This formed a convenient peg on which he might hang his Jacobite opinions, which he accordingly did in the Preface to his translation, besides leaving his readers to draw the obvious inference in reference to James's great-grandson from the work itself. It was by the express desire of Bishop Rose that he was consecrated a bishop at large in 1712. The consecration took place in London, and the consecrators were Bishops Hickes, Campbell, and Falconer. This was the only instance of an English Nonjuror helping to consecrate a Scotch bishop, the exception being probably made on account of the intimacy which subsisted between Hickes and Gadderar. On the other side Scotch Nonjurors constantly helped to consecrate English Nonjuring bishops, and Gadderar himself took part in three such consecrations in 1716. Gadderar, like Campbell, took a leading part in the correspondence between the Nonjurors and the Eastern Church, an account of which will be given in the next chapter; in this correspondence he signs himself 'Jacobus, Scoto-Britanniæ Episcopus.' When Campbell was elected diocesan bishop of Aberdeen in 1721 he commissioned Gadderar to act as his 'vicar,' and in 1725 he resigned his see by a formal deed in favour of Gadderar, who was also elected in the same year by the clergy of the diocese of Moray to be their ordinary. Gadderar ruled both dioceses, which were well within the compass of one man's work, with great vigour and success. He was a strong man, and left a permanent mark upon the Church. John Skinner, who was a working clergyman in Aberdeenshire for sixty-five years, wrote in 1788 (that is, fifty-five years after Gadderar's death): 'Of him I need say nothing, as he has left such a precious memory

behind him in our Church, especially in the diocese of Aberdeen, of which he long had the inspection.'[1] Another writer describes him as 'the stern and fearless Bishop of Aberdeen';[2] and well it was for the Church that he *was* stern and fearless, as the general history of the Scotch Nonjurors will show.

That history is unfortunately for some years a history of internal disputes. The apple of discord was thrown among the Scotch Nonjurors by their English brethren in 1718. It will be remembered that that was the year in which the English Nonjurors were divided into two separate Communions (for a time) on the subject of the Usages. It was agreed on both sides to consult the Scotch bishops and to abide by their decision. Accordingly on the part of the Usagers a Mr. Peak[3] made personal application to Bishops Rose and Falconer for a synodical determination; while on the part of the Non-Usagers Bishop Spinckes wrote to them to the same effect. Rose and Falconer acted, as one would have expected them to act, with great wisdom and courtesy. They very properly declined to make any synodical determination, which was quite beyond their province, seeing that the English Nonjurors were not under their jurisdiction, but they offered to act as friendly mediators; and they employed as competent a man as could have been found anywhere on either side of the Tweed, Dr. Rattray of Craighall, to draw up proposals of accommodation. Rattray, 'a man of singular knowledge in ecclesiastical literature,'[4] drew up proposals 'with much judgment, full of Christian temper, and making for peace;'[5] but neither the Usagers nor the

[1] Skinner, ii. 608. [2] Stephen, iii. 202.

[3] James Peake, Vicar of Bowden, in Cheshire, survived his deprivation in 1690 many years, and may have been the man; but it is more likely to have been Samuel *Peck*, who graduated in 1708.

[4] Skinner, ii. 626. [5] Lawson, p. 236.

Non-Usagers in England were then much inclined to peace. Rattray's proposals offended nobody, but they also affected nobody; and so the matter dropped as far as England was concerned.

The Usages controversy assumed a different phase in Scotland from what it did in England for two reasons: (1) The whole position of the Scotch Church in regard to liturgical questions differed from that of the English; (2) The question became mixed up with another dispute with which in itself it had nothing whatever to do. These two points must be worked out a little more in detail.

1. Strange to say, for many years the Scotch Episcopalians had never used any liturgy at all, the attempt to introduce the well-known Scotch Service Book in 1637 proving utterly abortive. When there arose a natural desire to introduce one, it was much more easy to adopt the English than the Scotch Office, for the excellent reason that, in consequence of the opposition of the Covenanters, very few Scotch Service Books had been printed, and subsequently the Scotch Church had been too poor to issue a reprint.[1] After the Union in 1707 the English Service Book began to be generally used, the adoption of it being greatly facilitated by liberal presents of books from England, especially from the University of Oxford, and from pious Churchmen with means, like Robert Nelson. But it was chiefly necessity which led to the introduction of the English Office, and it was always acknowledged that the Scotch *might* be used. Indeed, it sometimes *was* used. Bishop Falconer said in 1718 'that he himself had administered with the *Mixture*, and by the Scotch Prayer Book years back, long before any dispute had commenced at London;' and he intimated that Bishop Rose had acted similarly.[2] Then the fact that

[1] See Skinner, ii. 627.

[2] See Skinner, ii. 626.

after the severe Act of 1719 clergy of English ordination began to officiate in Scotland, and by degrees to deny the authority of the Scotch bishops, naturally tended to prejudice patriotic Scotch Churchmen against English customs generally and the English Liturgy in particular.[1] Hence the Usages, which agreed better with the Scotch than with the English book, were likely to find favour with many in Scotland.

2. The Usages question became mixed up with the larger question, 'Was the Church to be governed by Diocesan Bishops or by a College of Bishops at large?' for the Diocesan party were for the most part Usagers, the College party, Non-Usagers. It was a pity that the former weighted themselves with this extraneous matter, for, tried by the test of Church principles in all ages, they were manifestly in the right, while the adoption of the Usages was a question on which good Churchmen might hold different opinions.

With Bishop Rose the last of the Diocesan bishops passed away, and all who remained were merely bishops at large. Accordingly, at a meeting of all the Episcopal clergy, held at Edinburgh in that year, Bishop Falconer said that 'though they were bishops of this Church, intended for preserving Episcopal succession in it, they did not pretend to have jurisdiction over any particular place or district in it;' he therefore advised them 'to choose proper persons for the management of the affair.'[2] It was then proposed that they should acknowledge Bishops Fullarton, Falconer, Millar, and Irvine as an Episcopal College, to whom as such canonical obedience was due. This was entirely ignoring Bishops Campbell and Gadderar, who, though absent in London, had equal rights with the rest; and there is little doubt that they were

[1] See Grub, iii. 378–9.

[2] See Skinner, ii. 628–9.

ignored not because they were absent, but because they were Usagers. The proper course would surely have been under the circumstances to have filled the vacant sees by due election and consecration. But here unfortunately the political or politico-ecclesiastical difficulty came in. The nomination to vacant sees was part of the Royal prerogative, and they must have recourse to the King over the water. The Chevalier was quite ready to stand upon his rights, and addressed the bishops in the most lofty tone. He graciously approves of the appointment of Bishop Fullarton as the successor of Bishop Rose; 'but,' he adds, 'as to such future promotions as may be thought necessary for the preservation of your order, we think it equally for our service and that of your Church that, notwithstanding our present distance from you, you should propose to us such persons as you may think most worthy to be raised to that dignity,'[1] and he actually appointed David Fairbairn to a bishopric on his own account.

Now, really this was a sort of parody on the Erastianism which prevailed too much in the sister Church of England. In England the King and his ministers were at any rate persons who possessed real power, and were tied down by certain safeguards: the King by the Coronation Oath was bound to be a member of the Church of England, and his ministers were professedly of the same religion. But here was a phantom monarch who had not, and by this time was not likely ever to have, the slightest power of enforcing his orders, who could not reasonably be expected to have the Church's interest at heart, seeing that he belonged to another communion, expecting his commands to the Church to be obeyed as if he were already seated on the throne of his ancestors!

[1] See Lawson, p. 225.

But the Church rebelled, in spite of its loyalty. In 1720 the clergy of Forfar and Kincardine successfully insisted upon having the saintly Falconer for their diocesan; and, emboldened by their success, the clergy of Aberdeen elected Campbell to be bishop of that diocese. Then, in order to strengthen the party of the Collegers and Non-Usagers, no less than four new bishops were consecrated on that side, Andrew Cant and David Fairbairn in 1722, and Alexander Duncan and Robert Norrie in 1724. In 1723 a meeting of the College of Bishops was held at Edinburgh, when Bishop Irvine, who was virtually Primus, Bishop Fullarton being now old and inactive, headed a remonstrance to the Episcopal Church 'exhorting and obtesting them all to shun those fatal rocks whereon others have been shipwrecked before; and requiring the clergy in particular to forbear *mixture* and other obsolete Usages.' But this only succeeded in bringing to the front the ablest and most learned man on either side, *Dr. Thomas Rattray* (1684–1743), who wrote a long reply which admirably defended, not only the Usages, but also, what was far more important, the independence of the Church in managing her own affairs.

The unseemly exhibition of the two parties appointing bishops against one another went on for some years; but in 1732 a concordat was arrived at which virtually gave the victory to the Diocesan party, and from that time 'the land had rest fourteen years.'

The only event which need be noticed during the peaceful interval between the settlement of the disputes and the rising of 1745 is one which brings together for a moment the English and the Scotch Nonjurors. In 1744 the Edinburgh clergy, being discontented with the action of the bishops in issuing canons without consulting their presbyters, corresponded with Bishop George Smith,

whose name, it is hoped, the reader will not have forgotten. The interference of Bishop Smith was irregular; for the English Nonjurors had no status in the Scotch Church; but in fairness to him it should be remembered that he was closely connected in more ways than one with the Scotch, as we have seen in a former chapter.[1]

Faint rumblings of the storm which had passed away might still be heard in complaints against attempts to introduce 'forbidden usages' on the one side, and against attempts to re-establish the secular influence which formerly prevailed in the College by means of the Chevalier and his trustees on the other.[2] But, on the whole, this was a peaceful and a prosperous time; everything seemed to be going well until the rising of 1745 again unsettled it all. And yet the Scotch Nonjurors, as a body, took little part in that rising.

The alarm, however, created by the later enterprise was greater than that created by the earlier, as also was the exasperation against the supposed abettors of it. There was a determined effort to stamp out Jacobitism in Scotland. The conquerors made no nice distinction between active Jacobites and passive Nonjurors; they thought that both were tarred with the same brush; and against both far greater severities were exercised after the '45 than after the '15. In fact, a systematic and determined attempt was made to stamp out, no only the Nonjuring Church, but Episcopacy generally in Scotland.

An English Churchman may feel thankful that, though the House of Commons, in its state of alarm and indignation, passed a Bill to this effect in 1746, the English bishops opposed it in a body in the House of Lords, three of them, Secker, Sherlock, and Madox, speaking against

[1] See *supra*, p. 321, note 1.

[2] See Grub, iv. 9.

it. Of these three, Bishop Sherlock, who had always appreciated the merits and realised the position of the Nonjurors better than most of the complying clergy, deserves special notice. Having expressed frankly his opinion that the Nonjuring clergy sympathised with the late rebellion, he drew a very different conclusion from that which was probably expected.

> These clergymen, my Lords, by the purity of religious doctrine, learning, decency of behaviour, and chiefly by their sufferings, recommended themselves to the affection and esteem of all ranks of people, and by their example, as well as private lectures, recommended with great power those political principles they professed. These are the men we ought to gain over by mi'd usage, if possible; and the more of them we gain over, the more strength we shall add to our present happy establishment, the more we shall weaken the cause of the Pretender.[1]

This was no more than the truth. Nothing could exceed the quiet inoffensiveness and the patient submission of the Nonjuring clergy in those times of storm and stress which succeeded the rising of '45; but at the same time they were determined—and who can blame them?—to worship God in their own way and to supply the means of worship to those who agreed with them; and their efforts to do so remind us of the early Christians who worshipped in the caves and dens of the earth.[2]

When George III. ascended the throne, he at once set his face against the enforcement of the cruel laws; this was all the more creditable to him because the Scotch Nonjurors could not, of course, send in loyal addresses as

[1] Quoted by Grub, iv. 39.

[2] For details see *History of the Church in Scotland*, by Michael (afterwards Bishop) Russell (ii. 405), whose testimony is the more valuable because he belonged to 'the liberal school,' and gave offence to stricter Churchmen by his 'liberal views'; and Bishop Walker's 'Charge,' quoted by Stephen, iv. 345.

other religious bodies did. Kindness begets kindness, and the Nonjuring Church was less inclined than ever to enter into any measures against the Government; till at last, on the death of Charles Edward in 1788, 'the Bishops met at Aberdeen, and after mature deliberation with their clergy unanimously agreed to submit to the government of King George, and to testify this compliance by uniformly praying for him by name in public worship.'[1] Here we must stop; when the Church ceased to be a Nonjuring Church its doings ceased to come within the province of this work.

[1] Skinner, ii. 688.

CHAPTER XI

THE NONJURORS AND THE EASTERN CHURCH

It was only natural that the Nonjurors, holding the views they did, should yearn for union, or at least intercommunion, with other Churches, and should be ready to make any sacrifice, short of actual principle, to attain it. They could not possibly accept the position of one among a number of sects; they fondly hoped, even against hope, that the National Church would come round to their views, and many of them did their best, consistently with their principles, to throw no obstacles in the way of reunion or, perhaps it would be more correct to say, reabsorption. But meanwhile they were quite isolated, so far as England was concerned. Union with Rome was out of the question; for, though they were often absurdly charged with being papists at heart, they were, in fact, as a body, Protestant to the backbone. Rome had no sympathy with them, nor they with Rome. But there was another Church older, and perhaps greater, than Rome itself—a Church which had preserved an uninterrupted succession from the Apostles for 1700 years—a Church which was the mother of saints, such as Polycarp, Ignatius, Chrysostom, and countless others. In short, in despair of the West, might they not turn to the East, and there find friends with whom they might be united in the bonds of Christian fellowship? A closer communion with the great Eastern Church was no new project on the part of English Churchmen, and

especially that type of English Churchmen who would have most in common with the Nonjurors. The great Jacobean and Caroline divines, of whom the Nonjurors were in a very real sense the legitimate successors, had shown a deep interest in the subject. Lancelot Andrewes had taught English Churchmen to pray in the very words (translated) of the Greek Church, and had put into their mouths petitions 'for the Churches—Catholick, Eastern, Western, British'; 'The Church Ecumenical, Eastern, Western, our own'; 'for the Catholick Church, its establishment and increase; for the Eastern, its deliverance and union.'[1] On the execution of the Nonjurors' Martyr-King in 1649, the Greek Church had addressed an earnest remonstrance to the English Government; Isaac Basire, the friend of that staunchest of staunch Nonjurors, Dean Granville, had spent fifteen years of enforced exile during 'the troubles' as a sort of apostle of the English Church in the East; Thomas Smith, one of the most learned of all the Nonjurors, had been chaplain at Constantinople, and in that capacity had learnt much about, and taken a great interest in, the Greek Church, and had written more than one account of it; the chief of the 'deprived Fathers,' William Sancroft, had on more than one occasion been brought into contact with the Greek Church, and another deprived Father, Bishop Frampton, still more closely.

In the reign of Queen Anne a Greek prelate, Arsenius, Metropolitan of Thebais, came to England to implore the aid of good Christians for his Church, which was reduced to great distress through the tyranny of the Turks. He lingered on until 1716, and it was through him as intermediary that the overtures of the Nonjurors

[1] See the Introduction to G. Williams's *Orthodox Church of the East*, &c. p. vii.

were first made and the negotiations carried on for nearly nine years. The correspondence is of great length and great interest; but as it proved utterly abortive, and as, in the language of the accomplished scholar to whom we owe its first publication in all its fulness, it 'almost defies analysis,'[1] it has been thought best in the present work to supply the reader simply with the gist of it. The account of its rise and progress, apart from its subject-matter, must first be told in the language of Dr. Thomas Brett, one of the chief actors in its later phase. This may be transcribed without any preface or explanation, because all the names which occur will be familiar to every reader of the preceding pages. Dr. Brett, then, writes the following

SHORT ACCOUNT OF THE WHOLE AFFAIR.

In the month of July 1716, the Bishops called Nonjurors, meeting together about some affairs relating to their little Church, Mr. Campbell took occasion to speak of the Archbishop of Thebais then in London; and proposed that we should endeavour an Union with the Greek Church, and draw up some propositions in order thereto, and deliver them to that Archbishop, with whom he intimated, as if he had already had some discourse upon that subject. I was then a perfect stranger to the doctrines and forms of worship of that Church, but as I wished most heartily for a general union of all Christians in one communion, I was ready to have joined with Mr. Campbell on this occasion: But Mr. Laurence being in the room, drew me aside, and told me, that the Greeks were more corrupt and more bigoted than the Romanists, and therefore vehemently pressed me not to be concerned in this affair. Therefore I then declined it. But Mr. Collier, Mr. Campbell, and Mr. Spinkes joined in it, and drew up proposals, which Mr. Spinkes (as Mr. Campbell informed me) put into Greek, and they went together

[1] Introduction to *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century, being the Correspondence between the Eastern Patriarchs and the Nonjuring Bishops*, &c., by George Williams, Senior Fellow of King's College, Cambridge.

and delivered them to the Archbishop of Thebais, who carried them to Muscovy, and engaged the Czar in the affair, and they were encouraged to write to his Majesty on that occasion, who heartily espoused the matter, and sent the proposals by James, Proto-Cyncellus to the Patriarch of Alexandria, to be communicated to the four Eastern Patriarchs. Before the return of the Patriarchs' answer to the proposals, a breach of communion happened among the Nonjurors here, Mr. Hawes, Mr. Spinkes, and Mr. Gandy on the one side, and Mr. Collier, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Gadderar, and myself on the other. So that when the Patriarchs' answer came to London, in the year 1722, Mr. Spinkes refused to be any further concerned in the affair, and Mr. Gadderar and I joined in it. After Mr. Gadderar went to Scotland, Mr. Griffin, being consecrated, joined with us. The rest of the story relating to this matter may be gathered from the Letters and the Subscriptions to them. Mr. Collier subscribes Jeremias, Mr. Campbell Archibaldus, Mr. Gadderar Jacobus, Mr. Griffin Johannes, and I, Thomas.

THOMAS BRETT.

March 30th, 1728.

A brief, but accurate, account of the correspondence appeared in 1788 in Mr. Skinner's 'Ecclesiastical History of Scotland' (vol. ii. pp. 634–40); but the whole correspondence, at least on one side, was first rendered accessible to English readers by Mr. Lathbury in his 'History of the Nonjurors' (1845). Having been furnished with a copy which was preserved among manuscript collections of Bishop Jolly, he printed for the first time all the letters of the Nonjurors, and extracts from the letters of the Patriarchs, giving also a summary of their arguments. Then, in 1868, Mr. George Williams published a volume containing the whole correspondence on both sides, and various letters and documents bearing upon the subject. He had the advantage of being able to collate three distinct manuscripts: (1) That of Dr. John Jebb; (2) that of Bishop Jolly, then deposited at Trinity College, Glenalmond, now transferred to the Theological College of

the Episcopal Church, Edinburgh; and (3) a volume in the Advocates' Library, Edinburgh.

But though Mr. Williams found and collated perfectly correct copies of the correspondence, the original documents 'baffled,' he says, 'my search.' So the present Bishop of Edinburgh (Dr. Dowden) contributed another valuable addition to our knowledge by publishing a short paper in the 'Journal of Theological Studies,' which gives an account of these documents, and also a contemporary catalogue, drawn up by one who knew the inner history of the movement and tells us who were the readers and the translators of all the documents on the Nonjurors' side. We find from it that the first 'Proposal' was 'concocted at Mr. Hawes's'; that the English was probably drawn up by Mr. Collier or Dr. Lee, the Latin by Dr. Lee, and the Greek by Mr. Spinckes; that the long and extremely able 'Reply to the Patriarchs' Answer to the Proposal' was drawn up also by Collier, who was, in fact, the composer of most of the documents; while the translator, both from English into Greek and Latin on the one side, and from Greek and Latin into English on the other, was chiefly T. Wagstaffe, but in some cases Mr. Jebb, Mr. Griffin, and Mr. Ford.[1] Curiously enough, Campbell, who was the first to move in the matter, and Brett, who on such a subject was the best qualified of all, only appear to have drawn up one document apiece, and neither of them a very important one. But to turn to the correspondence itself.

The first document was termed 'A Proposal for a Concordate betwixt the orthodox and Catholick remnant of the British Churches, and the Catholick and Apostolical

[1] Among the Nonjuring Ordinations in the Rawlinson MSS. is the following: '1721, June 20, William Weldon Ford deacon, and 1722, Septr. 6, preist by Mr. Collier.'

Oriental Church,' and it began with a sufficiently startling proposal—nothing less than an alteration in the order of the four patriarchal sees, the Church of Jerusalem to come first instead of last. Of course the reason given is a valid one: 'Jerusalem the mother of us all' was the natural 'principle of ecclesiastical unity.' But was it likely that the unchanging East would change an order which had been regularly settled by synodical authority hundreds of years ago at the instance of a small community in a distant island, about which it appears to have had very little knowledge? Nor was it much more likely that the Eastern Church should be interested in the restoration of 'the most ancient English Liturgy,' seeing it had liturgies of its own which it had not the slightest intention of altering. Then, having specified twelve points in which they agreed with the Eastern Church, the bishops mention certain others 'wherein at present they cannot so perfectly agree': (1) They cannot put the canons of general councils on a level with Scripture; (2) they are afraid of giving the glory of God to a creature, even to the Mother of the Lord; (3) they are jealous of detracting in the least from the mediation of Jesus Christ, and therefore cannot use a direct invocation to any angel or saint, not even the Blessed Virgin; (4) though they worship Christ as verily and indeed present in the Holy Eucharist, they hesitate about worshipping the sacred symbols of His Presence; and (5) they demur to the Eastern use of pictures and images, fearing it might give 'scandal on the one hand to the Jews and Mahometans, and on the other to many well-meaning Christians,' to prevent which they suggest that an explanation of the 9th Article of the 2nd Council of Nice would be desirable. Finally, they propose that, if a Concordate be aimed at, a church called the Concordia

should be built in or about London under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Alexandria, and promise that if they are 'restored to their just rights' they will arrange 'on certain days Divine Service in the Cathedral Church of S. Paul according to the Greek rites.'

The document is dated 'London, August 18th, 1716.' The answer did not arrive for nearly five years, 'not,' as Archbishop Arsenius is careful to explain, 'owing to Contempt, but because the Patriarchs were occupied in a Synodical Examination of it.' But when it *did* arrive 'by James the Reverend Patriarchal Protocyncellus [*sic*], the Person that carried the Questions to the Patriarchs,' it certainly could not be complained of on the score of brevity. It is a document of portentous length, filling fifty-two printed pages 8vo., exclusive of two 'Synodical Explications,' which fill sixteen more. It minutely analyses all the proposals and difficulties of the Nonjuring bishops, and criticises several of them with considerable severity. The sum of it all was that the Eastern Church could alter absolutely nothing, and that it was only on these terms that a Concordate could be arrived at. The Patriarchs seem not to be quite clear as to whom they were addressing. 'They who call themselves the Remnant of Primitive Orthodoxy in Britain'—thus (adopting, as will be seen, the bishops' own language) they designate them, being evidently puzzled as to their exact status. The whole British Church would not appear to be a large one to representatives of the great Church of the East. What must a 'remnant' of it be?

They begin in a rather unpromising way by devoting several pages to the absolute perfection of their own Church, 'which holds the only true, religious, and right faith, and continues undefiled and most true,' and conclude this exordium by a hint that 'these Gentlemen,'

though 'lovers of Truth,' 'yet, being prepossessed with some old prejudices nourished and grown up with them, cannot easily part with them.' In this not very hopeful spirit they begin to examine their proposals. The first five, as 'they relate to one point, the order of the Patriarchal Throne,' admit of but one answer, and that a decided negative; it takes nearly five pages to make it, but that is what it amounts to. The sixth proposal relating to the revival of the ancient godly discipline seems to have been misunderstood by the Patriarch, owing apparently to the twofold meaning of the word *παιδεία*, 'discipline and instruction.' 'We can't conceive what kind of discipline it is they would instruct us in.' If it was in human learning, they had Aristotle's works and other philosophers, and schools in which they were taught and explained; if in Divine, they had the doctrine of the Fathers as the rule of their Divinity Instructions, and it was from no desire of instruction that they were inclined to union. The seventh proposal relating to conformity of worship is pronounced 'obscure and involved,' and is very briefly dismissed. The eighth, concerning restoration of the most ancient English Liturgy, is met by the answer that the Orthodox Church has the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom; there was no occasion for any other, and the 'Remnant' had better receive that. The ninth, promising a translation of the Homilies of Greek Fathers into English, to be read in the public assemblies, is graciously received; the English could not do better than read such homilies to benefit their souls. The last three proposals require no particular comment.

Turning now to the twelve points on which 'the suffering Catholick Bishops of the old constitution in Great Britain' agreed, the Patriarchs are satisfied (save in one or two minor details) with all except the third,

which deals with the celebrated 'Filioque' clause; they do not at all agree with the bishops' explanation of the clause, viz. that the Holy Ghost is sent *by* the Son *from* the Father, meaning no more than what the Eastern Church means.

> We receive none who add the least syllable, either by way of insertion, commentary, or explication to this Holy Creed, or take anything from it. . . . We cannot lawfully allow of the addition of the preposition διὰ or ἐκ, nor say either *from* or *by* the Son. But we wou'd have those who desire to communicate and agree with us, to keep it pure and without alteration. We don't allow it to be either publickly or privately read with addition,

with much more to the same effect.

But the last part of the bishops' letter is, of course, the great 'crux,' and on this the Patriarchs' answer is remarkably explicit, and not at all conciliatory.

> It is time [they say] to proceed to the point of greatest difficulty, viz.: the proposals, in which those who are called the British Remnant of Primitive Piety, disagree with us. But this is not to be wondered at. For being born and educated in the principles of the Luthero-Calvinists, and possess'd with their prejudices, they tenaciously adhere to them, like Ivy to a tree, and are hardly drawn off. So paint of a deep colour sinking into a Garment, is almost indelible; and the garment will grow rotten and decayed before the tincture can be washed off.

This prepares us for the rather severe criticism which follows. The first proposition, that the canons of ancient general councils are not of the same authority as the Sacred Text, and may be dispensed with by the governors of the Church where charity or necessity require, 'can by no means be received by the Eastern Church.' Then they argue this point out in detail, and conclude: 'If, then, those who are called the Remnant of primitive piety in Britain will be united to the Oriental Orthodox, they will do well to agree with us also in this particular,

who both think and speak what is true.' On the second proposition that 'tho' they call the Mother of our Lord blessed . . . . yet they are afraid of giving the glory of God to a creature,' the answer begins: 'Here we may fairly cry out with David, *They were in great fear where no fear was*,' and then they go on to explain at some length the well-known distinction between *Latria* and *Dulia*. On the third proposition, that 'they cannot use a direct invocation to any saint or angel, the ever-blessed Virgin herself not excepted, because they are jealous of detracting in the least from the mediation of Jesus Christ,' the Patriarchs begin again with a text of Scripture. 'As for the jealousy they speak of, it seems like the zeal of those of whom the Apostle says, *I testify of them that they have a zeal, but not according to knowledge*,' and then they proceed to instruct their ignorance, ending with this apostrophe:

Ye lovers of Piety, passing over these Mormoes [bugbears], embrace closely the dictates of Piety, and those things which are profitable for the soul, and are no ways hurtful to any body. '*Search*,' says He, '*the Scriptures, for in them ye shall find eternal life*.' And set yourselves free from the heavy bondage, and as I may say,[1] captivity of prejudice; shake it off, and submit yourselves to those true Doctrines which have been delivered from the beginning, and to the Traditions of the Holy Fathers, which are not opposite to the Holy Scriptures. For, we have good hopes of you, and do in our hearts spiritually rejoyce and leap for joy. For, you give us great expectations (even in this Proposition) of the wish'd for, and much desired happy union and agreement: which do thou, o Christ our King, quickly effect by Thy Almighty help, for the intercession of Thy immaculate Mother and all the Saints: for, we earnestly, and as we may say, from the bottom of our heart desire it.

[1] When the first person singular is used, it is the Patriarch of Jerusalem speaking in his own person, for it is said at the end of the answer, 'N.B. The foregoing Paper was in the original drawn up by the Lord Chrysanthus, the present Patriarch of Jerusalem.'

The fourth proposition, however, in which the bishops say they are for leaving the manner of Christ's Presence in the Holy Eucharist indefinite and undetermined, and think that people may worship Christ in spirit, as verily and indeed present, without being obliged to worship the Sacred Symbols of His presence, is the most offensive of all to the Patriarchs. 'How,' it is replied, 'can any pious person forbear trembling to hear this Blasphemy, as I may venture to term it? For, to be against worshipping the Bread, which is consecrated and changed into the Body of Christ, is to be against worshipping our Lord Jesus Christ himself our Maker and Saviour'; and then they argue this point out at some length.

The fifth and last proposition, ending with a request that the ninth article of the second Council of Nice concerning the worship of images be so explained by the wisdom of the Bishops and Patriarchs of the Oriental Church as to make it inoffensive, and to remove the scandal which may be occasioned (to Jews and Mahometans, as well as to many well-meaning Christians) is dealt with more tenderly, but no less explicitly. The Patriarchs declare it is impossible to alter the canon as required, and argue that if anything is to be given up for fear of causing scandal to Jews and Mahometans, the worship of Christ, which is the greatest scandal of all to them, would have to be given up. Those who object to image-worship 'are confuted from the first chapter of the Book of Genesis, in which it appears that God first made images, for he says, 'Let us make man after our own image and similitude'!

The last part of the bishops' proposal relating to the erection of a church in London, to be called Concordia, and the 'performance of a public service in the Cathedral of S. Paul in Greek and English,' they welcome most

cordially. The answers are said to have been drawn up in council at Constantinople, April 12, 1718, though they did not reach their destination until much later.

The 'Reply' of the Nonjuring bishops is also a lengthy document filling nearly twenty pages, and reflects credit both upon the heads and the hearts of those who drew it up. It confirms what has been said in these pages about the learning and ability of the later Nonjurors. It is perfectly packed with matter, and the numerous citations from the Scriptures and the Fathers are most apposite. Moreover, although the Patriarchs had written in a lofty tone of superiority which must have been rather exasperating, the bishops are never once betrayed into making reprisals; there is not one single bitter word in their reply. At the same time they are quite firm in their own opinions; though the temptation to so small a body to make concessions in order to win so large a body of allies must have been great, they never yield to it. The one point which they *do* yield is that in which they had been manifestly unreasonable—that is, in their very first proposal, that the order of the Patriarchate should be changed. 'Only,' they say, 'we conceive that the British Bishops may remain independent of all the Patriarchates'—a reasonable conception enough. On the sixth article they remark with obvious truth: 'We never intended to prescribe to the wisdom, or question the learning of the Catholic Oriental Church: Our meaning by the word *παιδεία* relating only to points of Discipline'; and no *English* reader could ever have mistaken their intention and meaning. Nor could any Englishman who knew what their real sentiments were doubt for a moment their sincerity in the following dignified disclaimer:

> What conjectures soever the Catholic Oriental Church might have to suspect us of Luthero-Calvinism, we openly declare,

that none of the distinguishing principles of either of those Sects, can fairly be charged upon us; and we farther believe, that upon the perusal of our Reply they will readily acquit us of any such imputation.

On the five points on which they had said in their first proposal that they could not 'perfectly agree,' they remain absolutely unmoved, and it is in defence of this position that their learning comes in most strikingly. The weakest part of the defence is that which deals with the doctrine of Transubstantiation. In their recoil from this they seem to give the impression that they did not consider the belief in a Real Presence essential, which could hardly have been their true meaning; for the Real Presence was manifestly an article of faith with all the Nonjurors. The general conclusion at which they arrive is this:

If, therefore, our Liberty is left us in the instances above mentioned: If the Oriental Patriarchs, Bishops &c. will authentically declare us not obliged to the Invocation of Saints and Angels, the worship of Images, nor the Adoration of the Host; If they please publickly and authoritatively by an Instrument signed by them, to pronounce us perfectly disengaged in these particulars; disengaged, we say, at home and abroad, in their churches and our own: These relaxing concessions allow'd, we hope may answer the Overtures on both sides, and conciliate an Union.

Then follows a reminder, which surely was much needed:

We farther desire their Patriarchal Lordships &c. would please to remember that Christianity is no gradual Religion, but was entire and perfect when the Evangelists and Prophets were deceased. And therefore the earliest Traditions are undoubtedly preferable, and the first Guides the best. For the stream runs clearest towards the fountain's head. Thus, whatever variations there are from the original state, whatever crosses in belief or practice upon the earliest ages, ought to come under

suspicion. Therefore, as they charitably put us in mind to shake off all prejudices, so we entreat them not to take it amiss, if we humbly suggest the same advice. We hope, therefore, their Lordships' impartial consideration will not determine by prepossession or the precedents of later times; but rather be govern'd by the general usages and doctrine of the first four Centuries, not excluding the fifth; than think themselves unalterably bound by any solemn decisions of the East in the eighth century, which was even then opposed by an equal Authority in the West.

It almost goes without saying that the Patriarchs did not stir one inch from their former attitude: 'We have nothing more to observe nor any other reply to make to all the propositions you have now sent us.' The Nonjurors must 'submit with sincerity and obedience, and without any scruple or dispute.' And to make matters quite clear, they send 'an exposition of faith' as contained in 'the Synod of Jerusalem,' commonly called the Synod of Bethlehem, in 1672, as an indispensable condition of intercommunion. This the Nonjurors could not, of course, accept; they professed to be English Churchmen, and as such they could be tied only to the Church of England's formulas.

The Nonjuring bishops also entered into a correspondence with a view to union with the 'Holy Governing Synod of Russia,' who were far less repellent than the Eastern Patriarchs. But the death of the Emperor of Russia (Peter the Great), who was most conciliatory and kind, in the midst of the negotiations, put a speedy termination to what would probably have been futile in any case.

The correspondence between the Nonjurors and the Eastern Church came to the knowledge of Archbishop Wake, who in 1725 wrote an indignant letter to Chrysanthus, Patriarch of Jerusalem, complaining that

certain schismatical Priests of our Church have written to you under the fictitious titles of Archbishops and Bishops of the Anglican Church, and have sought your Communion with them; who, having neither place nor church in these realms, have bent their efforts to deceive you who are ignorant of their schism.

He then adduces forcibly and ably the usual arguments against the Nonjuring separation; but his arguments would have had more force had it not been for the fact that fifty years before the vast majority of English Churchmen, including the archbishop's own two immediate predecessors, openly expressed views, the only logical result of which was their taking up the very position now held by the Nonjurors.

This last sentence brings us to the conclusion of the whole matter. The Nonjurors must be judged by the standard of the seventeenth, not that of the twentieth century. Brought up in the Church principles of the earlier period, they could not comply without manifestly setting those principles at defiance. So at least they argued, and from their own standpoint it is extremely difficult to answer their argument. Their case is clearly stated by one of their number 'whose sensitiveness to logic is as marked as his sensitiveness to conscience,'[1] William Law; and this work may fitly conclude with an extract from the manly letter which he wrote to his brother, announcing the loss of his fellowship because he could not take the oaths:

My prospect, indeed, is melancholy enough, but had I done what was required of me to avoid it, I should have thought my condition much worse. The benefits of my education seem

[1] See Sir Leslie Stephen's *English Thought in the Eighteenth Century*, ii. 39.

partly at an end, but that same education had been more miserably lost if I had not learnt to fear something more than misfortunes. As to the multitude of swearers, that has no influence upon me: their reasons are only to be considered; and everyone knows no good ones can be given for people swearing the direct contrary of what they believe. Would my conscience have permitted me to have done this, I should stick at nothing where my interest was concerned, for what can be more heinously wicked than heartily to wish the success of a person upon the account of his right, and at the same time in the most solemn manner, in the presence of God, and as you hope for mercy, swear that he has no right at all? If any hardships of our own, or the example of almost all people can persuade us to such practice, we have only the happiness to be in the broad way.

AN ALPHABETICAL LIST OF NONJURORS, CLERICAL AND LAY,

COMPILED PARTLY FROM NOTES ON INDIVIDUAL NONJURORS TAKEN IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS WORK, AND PARTLY FROM A COLLATION OF PREVIOUS LISTS, PRINTED AND MANUSCRIPT, VIZ.:

1. *A List of several of the Clergy and others in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, who were not thought to Qualify themselves upon the Revolution.* (Appendix No. VI. to the *Life of Mr. Kettlewell*, prefixed to the *Compleat Collection* of his Works, vol. i. pp. v–xiii. 1719.)

This was probably drawn up by Dr. Francis Lee, compiler of the Life, and was perhaps the list conveyed by Dr. Hickes to King James, with a view to the New Consecrations. As the title shows, it does not profess to be a complete list; it contains only the names of the earlier Nonjurors, and includes scarcely any of the laity. The strange vagaries of spelling which still prevailed in the early eighteenth century render it difficult in some cases to identify the names of persons, or places, or both. In short, though it is a most interesting and valuable document, 'it wanted,' as Mr. Warren says, 'a good deal of editing,' which it did not receive until he himself undertook the task after the lapse of 177 years.

2. *A Catalogue of the English Clergy and other Scholars who have refused to take the new oaths* in Bowles's *Life of Bishop Ken*, vol. ii. ch. xi. and xii. (1830.)

This is said to have been 'taken from a document among the Ken Papers, collected, probably under Ken, by the Rev. Mr. Harbin, chaplain at Longleat.' It was corrected, so far as the diocese of Bath and Wells went, in the *Life of Bishop Ken by a Layman* (J. L. Anderdon), Appendix C to vol. ii., but is still very imperfect and inaccurate.

3. *A List of the English Ecclesiastical Nonjurors of the Reign of William III.*, in an Appendix to *Palin's History of the Church of England from* 1688 *to* 1717. (1851.)

This is no improvement upon the preceding lists.

4. *A List, partly corrected, of the Nonjuring Bishops and other Clergy and Ecclesiastics of* 1689 *and later. Compiled from Kettlewell and other sources*, published anonymously by the late Rev. C. F. S. Warren. (1895.)

This is drawn up with great care and accuracy. Mr. Warren has been able to make some valuable additions and corrections from a MS. of 1733; he has taken infinite pains to identify *persons* from the published *Graduati Oxonienses* and *Cantabrigienses*, and *places* from Crockford's Directory; he has avoided repetitions and corrected endless obvious errors in the earlier lists; but he modestly tells us in his Preface that it is still very imperfect, and he suspects that 'consultation of the Nonjuring treasures of the Bodleian would have very much improved it; but this was not in his power.' I am painfully conscious that the present list is also very imperfect, but it has the

advantage at any rate of having been drawn up after a careful consultation of the following manuscript treasures:

1. *An Alphabetical Catalogue of the Dignified and Beneficed Clergy and others who declined to take the oaths required after the Revolution in* 1688. (Rawlinson MSS. in the Bodleian Library, D. 1238.)

This is Dr. Rawlinson's own list. It is not in his handwriting, but it contains notes by him, and appended to it is a letter from Mr. Browne Willis to him, in which he calls it 'your list.' It contains 311 names.

2. *The Names of y^e^ Clergy, Fellows of Colledges, and Schoolmasters who have not taken y^e^ Oaths to y^e^ Government in* 1699. [Laurence] *Howell's Collections for Cambridge.* (Rawlinson MSS., B. 281 in the Bodleian.) About 355 names.

3. Manuscripts in the Library of St. John's College, Cambridge, including

   (*a*) *The names of the Suspended and Deprived Clergie in the Diocese of Norwich* (37), with a heading in Thomas Baker's handwriting, 'This was drawn up in order to their relief.'

   (*b*) *Clergy in the Diocese of York* (14), whose cases are fully described in a letter from a Mr. Watkinson of York to Bishop Lloyd of Norwich, written at the Bishop's request, also evidently with a view to their relief. This is from a MS. left by Bishop Lloyd himself to St. John's College.

   (*c*) *A Catalogue of Nonjurors, Writers, from the year* 1689. It contains 154 names, several of which are not mentioned in other lists.

   (*d*) *Ordinations and Institutions of Nonjurors and Successors of Cambridge.* 18 names.

'Ex Epist. Tho. Baker ad Dr. Rawlinson,' January 22, 1732–3.

(*e*) *Matriculations. Admissions of Nonjurors at Oxford.* 23 names. 'Ex Epist. N. Cyrnes ad Dr. Rawlinson,' February 11, 1731–2.

(*f*) *Matriculations of Nonjurors of St. John's College at Cambridge.* 13 names, with full descriptions. 'Ex Epist. Tho. Baker ad D^rem^ Rawlinson,' July 15, 1730.

(*g*) *Matriculations, Graduations, &c. of Nonjurors in Cambridge, ex epistolis Th. Baker ad D^rem^ Rawlinson, dat. July* 25, 1733, and *January* 4, 1733–4. 33 names, with descriptions.

(*h*) Another list, with the same title as above, 1730, containing 24 names and descriptions.

The imprimatur of so learned and accurate a man as Thomas Baker is most valuable.

I have also derived assistance in drawing up the list from *Hearne's Collections*, from the *Calendar of State Papers* (*Domestic Series*), from *The Cheshire Sheaf*, and from the Nonjuring Ordinations and Nonjuring Consecrations recorded by Rawlinson.

When a name is inserted on only one authority I have indicated that authority; when two or more authorities differ, and I cannot be sure which is right, I have given the alternative reading in brackets. The different authorities are referred to under the following letters:

K. = Kettlewell list. W. = Warren list.[1]
R. = Rawlinson list. L. H. = Howell list.
St. J. = St. John's MSS., including *a*, *b*, *c*, *d*, *e*, *f*, *g*, *h*.

[1] This includes all that is valuable in Bowles, 'a Layman,' and Palin; for my experience has been that when Mr. Warren differs from any of them, *he* is right, and *they* are wrong.

H. = Hearne.
Ch. Sh. = Cheshire Sheaf.

When *Complied* is attached to a name it means that the person refused the oath at first but took it later.

When *Penitent*, that he took the oath at first but repented and recanted.

When *Non-Abjuror*, that he stumbled at the oath of abjuration, not that of allegiance.

'V.' stands for Vicar, 'R.' for Rector, and 'F.' for Fellow.

NAME	PREFERMENT, ETC.	DIOCESE
Acworth, Thomas	V. of Pyrton, *Non-Abjuror*	Oxford
Adee, John	F. of B.N.C. Oxford	
Allen, Cuthbert	V. of Hornby	Chester
Alleyne, Thomas.	F. of St. John's, Camb.	
Altham, Roger	Canon of Ch. Ch. and Reg. Prof. of Hebrew, Oxford, *Complied*	
Amy, John	Ord. D. by Bishop Lloyd of Norwich, 1684	
Andrews, John	M.A. of Ch. Ch. Oxford	
Andrews, William	— Wedmore, Somerset	Bath and Wells
Andrews, —	Undergrad. of Univ. Coll., Oxford	
Anger, — [St. J.]	C. of Botesdale	Norwich
Appleford, Robert	F. of St. John's, Camb.	
Armytage, Christopher	F. of Peterhouse, Camb.	
Arnold, Thomas	R. of Deene	Peterborough
Aston, Thomas	Chaplain to Earl of Clarendon	
Audley, John	V. of St. Catherine Cree	London
Babington, —	V. of Trelleck	Llandaff
Bagshaw, John	V. of Sibbertoft	Peterborough

NAME	PREFERMENT, ETC.	DIOCESE
Bailey, Daniel	. . . . .	Hereford
Baker, Thomas	R. of Long Newton F. of St. John's, Camb.	Durham
Ball, John	C.C.C. Oxford	
Bankes, Charles	V. of Cheshunt	London
Barfoot, James	Usher of Abingdon School	Oxford
Barnes, Miles	Senior F. of Peterhouse, Cambridge	
Barrow, Henry	V. of Horton Kirby	Rochest'r
Bateman, John	F. of Merton, Oxford	
Battel, Arthur	Usher at Hertford School.	Lincoln
Bayley, John	Of Tettenhall	Lichfield
Bayley, Thomas	R. of Slimbridge (F. of Magd. Oxf.), *Complied*	Glo'cester
Baynard, John	Archdeacon of Connor	Connor
Beach, William	V. of Orcheston St. George	Sarum
Beaufort, James	V. of Lanteglos by Camelford	Exeter
Beaufort, John	Scholar of Trin. Coll. Camb., *Complied*	
Bedford, Hilkiah	F. of St. John's, Camb. R. of Whittering (N.-J. Bishop)	Peterborough
Bedford, Thomas	Son of the above, St. John's, Cambridge	
Bedford, William	C. of Brookland	Canterbury
Beeston, Edward	R. of Sproughton and Melton	Norwich
Bell, Thomas	V. of Askham	Carlisle
Benlowes, George	C. of Easington	York
Benson, Samuel	Archdeacon and Preb. [Canon Res., R. & L. H.] of Hereford, V. of Sellack	Hereford
Berkley, William	R. of Clophill	Lincoln (now Ely)
Bettenham, Jas.	Printer, London	
Beynon, Thomas	C. of Upton-on-Severn	Worcest'r
Billers, John	F. of St. John's and Public Orator, Camb.	

NAME	PREFERMENT, ETC.	DIOCESE
Bisbie, Nathanael	R. of Long Melford . .	Norwich
Bishop, William .	F. of Balliol, Oxford	
Blackbourne, Jno.	Trin. Coll. Camb., N.-J. Bishop	
Blackbourne, Th.	Trin. Coll. Camb. [St. J.]	
Bladon, William .	Of Woodstock, Trin. Coll. Camb., *Non-Abjuror*	
Blair, Patrick .	M.D. [St. J.]	
Boardman, Thos.	R. of Grappenhall . .	Chester
Bokenham, Anthony	R. of Helmingham . .	Norwich
Bold, Michael .	F. of Trinity Hall, Camb.	
Bolton, — . .	Undergrad. of B.N.C. Oxf.	
Bonwicke, Ambrose	Headmaster of Merchant Taylors' School . .	London
Bonwicke, Ambrose	Son of the above, St. John's Coll. Cambridge	
Boothe, Charles .	Last N.-J. Bishop	
Bosse, Richard .	V. of Leathley [R. of Scawby, R. and L. H.]	York
Boteler, Thomas .	F. of Trin. Coll. Camb., V. of Masworth, Bucks	Lincoln
Boteler, — .	R. of Cadoxton . .	Llandaff
Boteler, — .	R. of Litchborough [R.] .	Peterborough
Bowdler, Stephen	Undergrad. of B.N.C. Oxf.	
Bowdler, Thomas	Clerk of the Admiralty	
Bowyer, William	Printer, London	
Bowyer, William	'The learned Printer,' son of the above, St. John's, Camb.	
Bradley, Thomas	R. of Walton-on-the-Hill, and V. of Carshalton	Winchester
Bravell, Richard .	R. of Welton . . .	York
Bravill, Dr. . .	[L. H.]	Bristol
Breach, William .	Ch. Ch. Oxford, M.D.	
Brett, Daniel .	V. of Hockham . .	Norwich
Brett, Thomas .	R. of Betteshanger (N.-J. Bishop), *Penitent*	Canterbury
Brett, Thos., son of the above	(N.-J. Bishop) . . .	Canterbury

NAME	PREFERMENT, ETC.	DIOCESE
Brett, Thomas	V. of West Dean, and R. of Folkington	Chichester
Brian (*see* Bryan)		
Brokesby, Francis	V. of Rowley, *Complied*	York
Brome [Bruce, R.]	R. of Middleton Tyas, *Complied*	York
Brome [Broom, W.]	Commoner of Ch. Ch. Oxf.	
Brooke, Philip	St. John's Coll. Cambridge [St. J.]	
Brookes, Thomas [Edward, St. J.]	R. of Cunington, or Conington, *Complied*	Ely [Nor. R.]
Brown, Christopher	R. of Priston	Bath and Wells
Brown, Thomas	Archdeacon of Derby and Preb. [Canon Res., R.] of Lichfield	
Brown, William	Undergrad. of Balliol, Oxf. [W.]	
Browne, P. J.	M.D. of Manchester (N.-J. Bishop)	
Browne, Thomas	F. of St. John's, Cambridge	
Bryan, Matthew	R. of Limington [C. of Newington Butts, R.]	Bath and Wells
Buchanan, Chas.	R. of Farnborough, *Penitent, Complied*	Winchester
Buddle, Adam	F. of St. Cath. Hall, Cambridge, *Complied*	
Bull, Digby	R. of Sheldon	Lichfield
Bunnys, Edward	C. of St. Dionis Backchurch [Reader of, L. H. and St. J.]	London
Burdyn, Henry	V. of Beighton	Lichfield
Burgess, —		Bristol
Burrell, —	Of Gorleston [R. and St. J.]	Norwich
Carr, Richard	Preb. of Lincoln and R. of Huntingdon	Lincoln
Carr, William	R. of Jevington	Chichest'r

NAME	PREFERMENT, ETC.	DIOCESE
Carte, Samuel .		
Carte, Thomas, bro. of the above	Reader of the Abbey Church, Bath	Bath and Wells
Cartwright, Thos.	Bishop of Chester [ignored by L. H.]	Chester
Cartwright, Thos.	N.-J. Bishop	
Castle, — . .	Reader of Ormond Chapel [W.]	London
Cayley, Simon .	C. of Barston in Berkeswell and Chap. to Earl of Aylesbury, *Complied*	Lichfield
Cholmondeley, Francis	M.P., Cheshire [Ch. Sh.]	
Clarendon, Henry Hyde, 2nd Earl of		
Cock, John . .	V. of St. Oswald's, Durham	Durham
Cockburn, Patrick	C. of St. Dunstan's (East or West?)	London
Cole, Christopher	R. of Billesdon . .	Lincoln
Cole, — . .	R. of Chellesworth [W.] .	Norwich
Cole or Coles, Wm.	V. of Charlbury (F. of St. John's, Oxford)	Oxford
Collier, Jeremy .	Lecturer at Gray's Inn, N.-J. Bishop	London
Cooke, Shadrach .	Lecturer of Islington, R. of Tanfield, *Complied*	London Chester
Cooke, Thomas .	F. of St. John's, Camb.	
Cope, Jonathan .	V. of Betley [and Chap. to Sir J. Egerton, K.]	Lichfield
Cotton, Robert .	Lancashire (?) Esquire	
Cotton, John, his son		
Crane, John .	C. of Winwick . . .	Chester
Cressy, Joseph .	V. of Sheriff Hutton .	York
Creyk, John .	Of St. John's, Camb., Chaplain to Earl of Winchilsea	
Crofton, Richard .	Headmaster of Preston School	Chester

NAME	PREFERMENT, ETC.	DIOCESE
Crossman, James	V. of Banwell	Bath and Wells
Crosthwaite, Thomas	F. of Queen's, Oxf., and Preb. of Exeter	
Crowbrow, Sam.	Archd. of Nottingham, Preb. of York and of Southwell [R. of Southwell, L. H.], F. of Queens', Camb.	
Crowther [Crowder, L. H.], Joseph	Chanter of St. Paul's, Principal of St. Mary Hall, Oxford, Preb. of Worcester, R. of Tredington	London Worcester
Cuffe, John	R. of Wicken	Peterborough
Cumberland, —	C. of Tabley	Chester
Daillon, James, Count de Lude	V. of Wrawby	Lincoln
Davenport, John	R. of West Rasen, *Complied*	Lincoln
Davie or Davis, John	V. of Frodsham, *Complied*	Chester
Davis, Thomas	R. of Yerbeston	S. Davids
Davison, Jonathan	V. of Aldworth	Ely
Davison, Thomas	C. of Norton, *Complied*	Durham
Dawkins, George	V. of Icklesham	Chichest'r
Day, Henry	R. of Hunstanton	Norwich
Deacon, Thomas	N.-J. Bishop	
Dobree, —	R. of Sausthorpe and Aswardby	Lincoln
Dod, Samuel	V. of Chigwell	London
Dodwell, Henry	Camden Reader (Prælector) of History, Oxford	
Doughty, Henry	C. of Robin Hood's Bay [Filingdales, nr. Whitby, R.], [under Abp. of York, K.], N.-J. Bishop	York
Downes, Samuel	Probationer F. of St. John's, Oxford	

NAME	PREFERMENT, ETC.	DIOCESE
Downes, Theophilus	F. of Balliol, Oxford	
Dowsing, John	Chanter of Ely	
Dresser, Thomas	R. of Westley	Ely
Dunkyn, Maurice	Ireland	
Dunn, Jerman [Herman, St. J.]	R. of Waddington, *Complied*	Lincoln
Dykes [or Dyke, R.], Oswald	Senior Taberdar of Queen's, Oxford	
Eades, Thomas	V. of Chiddingly	Chichest'r
Earbery, Matthias	V. of Neatishead	Norwich
Eccles, —	Balliol Coll. Oxford [H.]	
Edmunds, David	R. of Kenilworth, *Penitent*	Lichfield
Edwards, —		Bristol
Edwards, Samuel	V. of Eye and R. of Weston [Troston, St. J.]	Norwich
Edwards, Thomas	Son of Vicar of Kingston	Hereford
Edwards, Thomas	Trinity Coll. Oxford	
Egerton, Philip	R. of Astbury, *Complied*	Chester
Ellerby, James	V. of Chiswick	London
Ellis, James	Schoolmaster at Thistleworth (Isleworth)	London
Ellys, Edmund	R. of East Allington	Exeter
Emmerson, Wm.	Scholar of St. John's, Camb.	
Enfield, Thomas	Trin. Coll. Oxford [F. of, L. H.]	
Ennis, Alexander (*see* Innes)		
Ensor, Richard	R. of Heckham [?]	Lichfield
Erskine, William	R. of Wrangle, *Complied*	Lincoln
Falkner, Thomas	V. of Middlewich, *Complied*	Chester
Farmer [Harmer, L. H.], Edward	V. of Montford	Lichfield
Farringdon, John	R. [C., Ch. Sh.] of Church Minshull	Chester
Fenton, Elijah	Poet, *Non-Abjuror*	
Fettiplace, Thos.	M.A. of St. John's Coll. Camb., Curate	

NAME	PREFERMENT, ETC.	DIOCESE
Fisher, — . .	C. of Warham [R., L. H., and St. J., Washbrook, W.]	Norwich
Fitzgerald, John.	Archdeacon of Dublin .	Dublin
Fitzwilliam[s], John	R. of Cottenham Canon of Windsor, F. of Magd. Oxford	Ely
Fletcher, James [Flesher, W.]	'A.M. of Ch. Ch. Oxf.' [R.]	
Fletcher, — .	V. of Marnham (near Newark)	York
Flud[Fludd, L. H. Flood, W.]	V. of Halstock . . .	Bristol
Ford, William Weldon	Ord. by Collier, D. 1721, P. 1722	
Fothergill, Marmaduke	R. of Skipwith . .	York
Fothergill, William	Ord. by Griffin, 1728	
Frampton, Robert	Bishop of Gloucester	
Fullerton, Wm. .	Balliol Coll. Oxford [H.]	
Gandy, Henry .	R. of St. Leonard's, Exeter, Sen. F. of Oriel, N.-J. Bishop	Exeter
Gardiner, Thomas	F. of All Souls', Oxford	
Garnett, Thomas	Of Manchester, N.-J. Bp.	
Gervase, Humphry (*see* Jervis)		
Gibbes, John .	R. of Gissing . . .	Norwich
Giffard, Francis .	R. of Russel [Rushall], Wilts, *Non-Abjuror* [H.]	Sarum
Gifford [Gyffard, W.], William	R. of Great Bradley . .	Norwich
Gilbert, John .	V. of Medmenham, Bucks.	Lincoln
Gilbert, Michael .	C. of Spexhall . .	Norwich
Gipps, George .	R. of Brockley . . .	Norwich
Gordon, Robert .	N.-J. Bishop	
Gosling[Gostling, R.], Isaac	V. of Sturry and C. of St. Mary Bredin	Canterbury
Gosling, — . .	Of —	Lincoln

NAME	PREFERMENT, ETC.	DIOCESE
Granville, Denis .	Dean and Archdeacon of Durham and R. of Easington and Sedgefield	Durham
Grascome [Grascomb, L. H.], Samuel	R. of Stourmouth . .	Canterbury
Grey, — . .	C. in Newcastle . .	Durham
Griffin, John .	N.-J. Bp., R. of Churchill	Worcest'r
Griffith, John .	Petty Canon and R. of St. Nicholas	Worcest'r
Grigg, William .	F. of Jesus Coll. Camb.	
Guy, Henry .	Of Kendall [not beneficed, K.]	Chester
Gwillym, James .	V. of Harewood . .	Hereford
Hall, Henry .	Son of R. of Castle Camps, a N.-J. Bishop	
Hall, James Acres	F. of B.N.C. Oxford, *Penitent*	
Hall, Joseph .	Son of R. of Castle Camps, ord. D. and P. in 1716	
Hall, Richard .	R. of Kettlethorpe . .	Lincoln
Hall, Thomas .	R. of Castle Camps . .	Ely
Hall, — . .	Chaplain to Countess of Kent [R. and L. H.]	
Hamerley [Ammersly, R. and L. H., Hammersley, K.], Chamberlain	V. of Burton Dassett .	Lichfield
Hanbury, Wm. .	R. of Botley . . .	Winchester
Hanbury, — .	Balliol Coll. Oxford, M.D., Utrecht [H.]	
Hansted, — .	R. of Searby . . .	Lincoln
Harbin, George .	Chaplain to Bishop Turner of Ely, and then to Lord Weymouth	
Harmer, — (*see* 'Farmer')		

NAME	PREFERMENT, ETC.	DIOCESE
Harsnett, Robert	Preb. of Wells R. of St. Clement's, Oxford, *Complied*	Bath and Wells
Hart, Percyval, M.P.	Of Lullingston, Kent	
Harte, Walter .	Preb. of Wells, Preb. of Bristol, V. of St. Mary Magd. Taunton (F. of Pembroke College, Oxf.)	Bath and Wells
Harvey, Joseph .	Preb. of Hereford and Chancellor of the Cathedral, R. of Weston-juxta-Ross, *Non-Abjuror*	Hereford
Hatton, Christopher	[St. J.] Esquire	
Hawes, Samuel .	R. of Braybrooke, Chaplain to Lord Griffin, a N.-J. Bishop	Peterborough
Headlam, Richard	[Fellow, R.] of St. John's Coll. Camb., *Complied*	
Hearne, Thomas .	Of St. Edmund Hall, Oxf., Assistant-Keeper of the Bodleian Library	
Hellier, George .	P.C. of Broomfield [V., R. and W.]	Bath and Wells
Herbert, Edward	New Coll. Oxf. [St. J.]	
Heron, Arthur .	St. John's Coll. Camb., *Complied*	
Heron, John .	Chaplain to Lord Preston, Scholar of St. John's, Cambridge	
Hickes, George .	Dean of Worcester, N.-J. Bishop	Worcest'r
Higden, William .	Lecturer and C. of Camberwell, *Complied*	Winchester
Higgons, Bevil .	[St. J.] St. John's College, Oxford, *Complied*	
Hildyard, — .	Chaplain to Countess of Yarmouth	Norwich
Hill, — . .	[W.] *Penitent*. . .	London
Hind, William .	[W.] Oxford	

NAME	PREFERMENT, ETC.	DIOCESE
Hobart, Thomas, M.D.	F. of Christ's Coll. Camb. [St. J.]	
Hobson, Joshua	V. of All Saints', Camb., F. of St. John's Coll.	Ely
Hodgson, Aaron	Usher of Stanstead Abbots School, Herts	Lincoln
Holbrooke, John	R. of Titsey	Winchester
Holder, Richard	C. of Stanford Bishop, *Complied*	Hereford
Holdsworth, Edward	Poet—Demy of Magd. Coll. Oxford	
Holford, Nathaniel	Chaplain to Duchess of Buckingham	
Hollis, John	V. of Brompton [W.]	York
Holmes, —	R. of Rustwick [Ponswicke, St. J.] and Vicar Choral of York	York
Holmes, —	V. of North Clifton	York
Hope, James	'C. to y^e^ A.B. [Abp.] in y^e^ East Riding' [R. & K.]	York
Hope, John	C. of Easington [F. of St. John's, Camb., R.]	Durham
Hopkins, Edward	F. of Lincoln Coll. Oxf.	
Horton, Alex.	R. of Kelshall, Herts	Lincoln
Horton, William	Master of the Haberdashers' School	London
Howard, Ephraim	F. of Queens' Coll. Cambridge	
Howell, John	R. of New Radnor	Hereford [St. Davids, R.]
Howell, Laurence	Master of Epping School, C. of Eastwick, Herts	Lincoln
Howell, Robert (*see* Nowell)		
Howell, Thomas (*see* Powell)		
Hughes, John	F. of Balliol Coll. Oxf., and Chaplain to Turkish Embassy	

NAME	PREFERMENT, ETC.	DIOCESE
Hughes, John .	Minor Canon of Peterboro' and C. of Eye	Peterborough
Hunt, — . .		Hereford
Hutton, Charles .	R. of Up-Lyme . .	Exeter
Hutton, John .	College Street, Westminster, friend of Samuel Wesley	
Hutton, Philip .	Of West Witton . .	Chester
Hutton [Hulton, R.]	V. of Bolton . . .	York
Innes, Alexander .	R. of St. Martin, Vintry, and St. Michael Royal	London
Islip, Robert .	St. John's Coll. Camb. [St. J.], ord. by Gandy, 1717	
Ives, Jonathan .	V. of St. Giles', Northampton	Peterborough
Jacomb, Thomas.	Master of the Free School, Coleshill	Lichfield
James, Nicholas .	Of Tregare . . .	Llandaff
Jebb, Samuel .	M.D., Peterhouse, Cambridge, ord. by Collier, 1716	
Jebb, Sir Richard, son of the above	M.D., Licentiate of Coll. of Physicians	
Jenkin, Robert .	F. of St. John's, Camb., V. of Waterbeach .	Ely
	Chanter of Chichester and Chaplain to the Bishop, *Complied* . .	Chichest'r
Jenkins, — . .	'Sea-captain, now a *Penitent*' [R.]	
Jennens, Charles .	Balliol Coll. Oxford, and Gopsall Park, Leicester	
Jervis, Humphry [Gervase, K.]	St. Alban Hall, Oxf. [W.]	Gloucest'r
Johnson, Henry .	Master of Wandsworth School	Winchester
Johnson, Matthew	C. of Kelloe, *Complied* .	Durham

NAME	PREFERMENT, ETC.	DIOCESE
Johnson, Richard [William, L. H.]	Master of King's School, Canterbury, *Complied*	
Johnson, Thomas	F. of St. John's, Camb., and V. of Madingley	Ely
Jones, Barzillai .	Dean of Lismore, and Treasurer of Waterford .	Lismore and Wat.
Jones, David .	Scholar of St. John's, Camb. [R.]	
Jones, Henry .	R. of Sunningwell . .	Win-chester
Jones, Henry .	Master of Wandsworth School	Win-chester
Jones, Richard .	Chancellor of Diocese of Bangor	
Jones, Robert .	V. of Cannington and C. of Calcott	Bath and Wells
Jones, Thomas .	C. of Efenechytd . .	St. Asaph
Jones, William .	Treasurer of Connor, and Chaplain to Bishop of Down	
Jones, — . .	C. of Lydd [Lydd, Bedford, R.]	Canter-bury
Kelly, George .	Trinity College, Dublin	
Ken, Thomas .	Bishop of Bath and Wells	
Kendall, Nicholas	C. of Elwick . . .	Durham
Kent, — . .	C. of Tissington . .	Lichfield
Kenyon, Roger .	F. of St. John's Coll. Camb., M.D.	
Kenyon, Roger .	St. John's, Camb., A.B., 'nec ultra progreditur' [St. J.]	
Kerrington, Rich.	R. of Tacolneston .	Norwich
Kerrington [Ledington, Wm., R.]	C. of Depden . .	Norwich
Kettlewell, John .	V. of Coleshill . . .	Lichfield
Keyt, Thomas .	R. of Binton . . .	Worcest'r
Killingbecke, Jno.	F. of Jesus Coll. Camb.	
King, Charles .	Student [Curate, R.] of Ch. Ch., Chaplain to Mr. Chetwynd	

NAME	PREFERMENT, ETC.	DIOCESE
King, Richard .	R. of Marston Bigott, Chaplain to Lord Weymouth	Bath and Wells
Kipping, Richard	Chaplain to Bp. of Norwich and R. of Fakenham (?)	Norwich
Kirby, William .	R. of Wickham [Whickham]	Durham
Kirkham, James .	R. of Wickwar . .	Gloucest'r
Knight, George .	C. of Keyworth [W.] .	York
Lake, John .	Bishop of Chichester	
Lake, Richard .	R. of Avon Dassett . .	Lichfield
Lake, Richard .	C. of Parham . . .	Norwich
Lake, William .	Son of Bp. of Chichester, *Complied*	
[Lake, William .	[F., R.] of St. John's, Camb. [St. J.], query same as above]	
Lamb, — . .	V. of Stillington, *Penitent* [K.]	York
Lambe, Seth .	V. of Ealing, *Non-Abjuror*	London
Laurence, Roger	N.-J. Bishop	
Law, William .	F. of Emmanuel Coll. Camb.	
Leake, John . .	Lecturer of St. Giles', Cripplegate, and St. Michael's, Queenhythe	London
Leake, John .	Hart Hall, Oxf. [H.], query same as above	
Leche, Thomas .	V. of Foxton, F. of St. John's Coll. Camb.	Ely
Lee, Francis .	M.D., F. of St. John's Coll. Oxford	
Lee, William .	Dyer in Spitalfields, brother of the above	
Leigh, John .	V. of Edenhall-with-Langwathby	Carlisle
Leigh, — . .	Choirmaster, [Chief Minister, R.] of St. Mary Overy, Southwark	Rochester

NAME	PREFERMENT, ETC.	DIOCESE
Leslie, Charles	Chancellor of Connor	Connor
L'Estrange, Sir Roger	Licenser of the Press [St. J.]	
Lewis, John	C. of Bolston } Query	St. Davids
Lewis, John	Of Jesus Coll. } same	(Hereford
	Oxford } man	now)
Lewis, Thomas	Scholar [R.] of Magd. Hall, Oxford	
Lightfoot, Thos.	V. of Roxby	York [Chester, W.]
Lindsay, David	C. of Croydon [Whitechapel, K.], *Complied*	London
Lindsay, John	N.-J. Minister of Trinity Chapel, Aldersgate Street	
Lloyd, John	R. of Llangar	St. Asaph
Lloyd, Richard	C. of Bridstow and Yarpole	Hereford
Lloyd, William	Bishop of Norwich	
Long, Thos., sen.	Preb. of Exeter, *Non-Abjuror*	Exeter
Long, Thos., jun.	R. of Whimple and Preb. of Exeter	Exeter
Lowndes, Ralph	R. of Eccleston	Chester
Lowndes, Ralph	Of Lea Hall, Middlewich, *Penitent*	Chester
Lowth, Simon	V. of Harbledown, R. of Cosmas Blean, Dean-elect of Rochester	Canterbury
Lowthian, Rich.	A.B., St. John's, Camb., ord. by Spinckes, 1722	
Lowthorp, John	R. of Coston, near Melton Mowbray	Lincoln
Ludlam, —	V. of Dalby Magna, near Melton Mowbray	Lincoln
Mackintosh, Alex.	R. of Woodmansterne	Winchester
Maddison, Chas.	V. of Chester-le-Street	Durham
Major, George	Emman. Coll. Camb. [W.]	
Malabar [Mallabarr, W.]	C. of Cottenham	Ely

NAME	PREFERMENT, ETC.	DIOCESE
Mallory, Thomas	R. of Mobberley . .	Chester
Manly, Robert .	R. of Powderham . .	Exeter
Manton, — . .	V. of Crook [W.] . .	Carlisle
March, John .	V. of Long Compton .	Worcest'r
Marsh, — . . .	[W.]	Ely
Marston, Edward	C. of Rushton, *Complied* .	Peterborough
Marten, William [Hugh, K.]	Vice-Principal of Hart Hall, Oxford	
Martin, John .	Preb. of Sarum and R. of Melcombe Horsey	Sarum
Martyn [Mason, W.], Thomas	R. of Holme Lacy [R. and L. H.]	Hereford
Massey, Middleton	A Keeper of Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, B.N.C.	
Maston, Edward.	V. of Dalby Parva, near Melton Mowbray	Lincoln
Mattaire, Michael	[H. and St. J.], but query?	
Mauliverer, John	[F. of, W.] Magdalene Coll. Cambridge	
Maurice [Morris, L. H.] [Morrice, R.], —	Minor Canon of Worcester and C. of Claines	Worcest'r
Mawburn, Luke .	R. of Crayke . . .	York
Mawman, Tim. .	N.-J. Bishop	
Maxwell, William	Min. of Wapping Chapel	London
Meaux, — . .	Of Woodstock, *Non-Abjuror*	Oxford
Metcalfe, — .	V. of Voles [St. Paul's ?] Cray	Canterbury
Milles, Richard .	V. of Ridge, near Barnet, *Complied*	London
Millington, James	Draper of Shrewsbury	
Milner, John .	Preb. of Ripon and V. of Leeds	York
Mingay, — . . .	C. of Holveston . .	Norwich
Minors, *see* Mynors		
Mitchell, Michael	V. of Pinchbeck . .	Lincoln
Montgomery, Robert	. . . . .	York
Moor, John. .	V. of Rustington . .	Chichest'r

NAME	PREFERMENT, ETC.	DIOCESE
Moor, Jonathan	Schoolmaster at Long Melford	Norwich
More, Ingram	V. of Mumby and Strubby	Lincoln
Morgan, Robert	Student of Ch. Ch. Oxf., *Complied*	
Morrice [Maurice, R.], Hugh	R. of Bangor-Monachorum	Bangor
Morse, William	R. of Llanwarne	Hereford
Moy, Anthony	Chaplain to Lord Ferrars of Chartley	
Munsey, Robert	R. of Bawdeswell	Norwich
Mynors, Willoughby	C. of Shoreditch	London
Nash, Gawen	Petty Canon of Norwich and V. of Melton	Norwich
Nash, John	F. of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge	
Naylor, John	F. of St. John's Coll. Camb.	
Nelson, Robert	*Complied.* Esquire	
Nelson, —	V. of —	York
Newcourt, Richd.	Registrar of the Bishop's Court	London
Newman, John	Trinity Coll. Cambridge [St. J.]	
Newmarsh, Tim.	N.-J. Bishop	
Newson, Stephen	R. of Hawkedon	Norwich
Newton, George	R. of Cheadle and V. of Prestbury	Chester
Nicholls, Matthew	C. of Eggesford	Exeter
Nicholls, Richard	V. of Welton	Peterborough
Nixon, Robert	Ord. by Gandy, 1717	
Norres, Ralph	V. of South Littleton	Worcest'r
North, Roger	Steward to the See of Canterbury, son of the 4th Lord North	
Nowell, Robert	V. of Seaford and Bishopstone	Chichest'r
Nutting, John	Pembroke Coll. Oxford	

NAME	PREFERMENT, ETC.	DIOCESE
Oakely, Jeremy	R. of Sutton	Winchester
Oakes, John	V. of Whitegate	Chester
Oldham, Richard	R. of Streatham, F. of St. John's, Cambridge	Ely
Oldham, —.	Chaplain to the Earl of Chesterfield	Lichfield
Onley, Humphry [Vanogden, W.]	R. of Little Budworth	Chester
Orme, Robert	V. of Wouldham, *Penitent*	Rochester
Osborn, —	C. of Aldgate	London
Osbourne, William	'Chaplain to my Lord Weymouth' [R.]	Bath and Wells
Otway, Charles	Doctor of Laws [K.]	
Owen, John	R. of Tuddenham	Norwich
Owen, Michael	V. of Langhorne and R. of Eglwys	S.Davids
Palmer, —		Hereford
Paman, Henry	M.D., Master of the Faculties to the Archbishop of Canterbury	Canterbury
Panting, Henry	R. of St. Martin's, Worcester, and Upton-on-Severn	Worcest'r
Parker, Samuel	Son of the Bishop of Oxford, *Complied* (?)	
Parr, Bartholomew	V. of —	Exeter
Pattrick, Jerman	C. of Haddenham	Ely
Peake, James	V. of Bowdon (F. of Magd. Coll. Cambridge)	Chester
Pearce, —	Attorney of Took's Court, London	
Pearson, Richard	R. of St. Michael's, Crooked Lane	London
Pearson, Matthew	F. of St. John's, Camb., *Complied*	
Peck, Francis	Trinity Coll. Cambridge	
Peck, Samuel	Trin. Coll. Camb. [St. J.]	
Perkins, Joseph	C. of —, *Penitent* [K.]	Gloucest'r
Perne, John	F. of Peterhouse, Camb. [St. J.]	

NAME	PREFERMENT, ETC.	DIOCESE
Pert, Arthur .	[F. of, L. H.] Queens' Coll. Cambridge	
Philips, John .	Student of Ch. Ch. Oxford [R.]	
Philips, Vincent .	Trin. Coll. Oxford	
Phillips, Stephen	Scholar of Trinity Coll. Cambridge	
Phillips, William	F. of Cath. Hall, Camb., and C. of Long Melford	Norwich
Pickering [Puckering, Ch. Sh.], John	Schoolmaster of Middlewich	Chester
Pickering, John .	V. of Ferring, South Heighton, and Westham	Chichest'r
Pierce, John .	Ord. by Collier, 1725	
Pigeon, — . .	C. of St. Andrew's, Undershaft	London
Pinchbeck, Martin	C. of Freiston and Schoolmaster at Butterwick, *Penitent*	Lincoln
Pincock, Thomas	Usher of Preston School .	Chester
Pincocke, William	Senior F. of B.N.C. Oxf.	
Pine, William .	[Student of, L. H.] Ch. Ch. Oxford	
Pinsent, — . .	Undergrad. of St. John's Coll. Cambridge	
Pitts, John . .	R. of St. Lawrence [St. Giles, St. J.], Norwich	Norwich
Pocklington, Charles	R. of Brington, Bythorn, and Old Weston	Lincoln (now Ely)
Podmore, Thomas	Master of Millington's Hospital, Shrewsbury	
Polwhele, Thomas	V. of Newlyn [Newland, R. and L. H.]	Exeter
Potinger [Pottinger, R. and L. H.], Daniel	R. of Nettleton . .	Lincoln
Powell [Howell, R. & L. H.], Thos.	C. of New Radnor . .	Hereford
Powell, Timothy .	V. of St. Cleers and R. of Robeston West	S. Davids

NAME	PREFERMENT, ETC.	DIOCESE
Pownoll, Edward	Of Shottesbrooke [H.]	
Pretty, Edward .	R. of Little Cornard [Corneath, R. and St. J.], *Penitent*	Norwich
Price, Henry .	V. and Preb. of St. Asaph and Schoolmaster of Ruthin	St. Asaph
Price, Kenrick .	N.-J. Bishop	
Prichard, John .	Of Winforton . . .	Hereford
Prichard, William	V. of Eglwyswrw, *Penitent*	S. Davids
Pulford, — . .	Herts	Lincoln
Rawlinson, Rich.	St. John's Coll. Oxford, N.-J. Bishop	
Rawlinson, Thos., brother of the above		
Redmayne, Peter	[Fellow, W.] of Trin. Coll. Camb.	
Rich, Samuel, Dr.	[L. H.]	Bristol
Richards, William	R. of Helmdon (and Lecturer of St. Andrew's, Newcastle)	Peterborough
Richardson, John	R. of North Luffenham .	Peterborough
Richardson, Sam.	C. of Little Bradley, *Complied*	Norwich
Richardson, — .	C. of Great Thurlow .	Norwich
Rickaring, John [R.] (*see* Pickering)		
Roberts, Lewis .	V. of West Firle and Beddington	Chichest'r
Roberts, Thomas	Minor Canon and R. of St. Nicholas' [St. Giles', R. and L. H.]	Worcest'r
Robinson, Nicholas	M.D. [St. J.]	
Robinson, Wm. .	. . . . .	Gloucest'r
Robson[R.&L.H.]	V. of Stonehouse	
Rogerson, Thos. .	R. of Ampton, Suffolk .	Norwich

NAME	PREFERMENT, ETC.	DIOCESE
Rokeby, Francis .	Undergrad. of St. John's Coll. Camb. [son of Major E. Rokeby, R.]	
Roper, Francis .	F. of St. John's Coll. Camb. Preb. of Ely, R. of Northwold, and Canon of Norwich	Ely Norwich
Ross, Thomas .	R. of Rede . . .	Norwich
Ross, Thomas .	R. of Scalby, or Scawby .	York
Ross, Thomas .	R. of Hunmanby [W.], *Penitent*	York
Rotheram, —	[W.]	Bath and Wells
Rowe, — . .	Ord. by Collier, 1716	
Russell, Richard .	Univ. Coll. Oxford [St. J.]	
Rutter, John .	M.A., ord. by Collier, 1716	
Saffyn, Richard .	V. of Berkeley . . .	Gloucest'r
Sagar, Seager, or Seagar	B.N.C. Oxford	
Sage, Elisha .	[W.]	Bristol
Sagg, Thomas .	Reader in Christ Church [the chief church, K.], Hull	York
Salmon, Nath. .	C. of Westmill, Herts .	Lincoln
Salter, Abraham .	V. of Edwardstone . .	Norwich
Sancroft, William	Archbishop of Canterbury	
Sanderson, James	St. John's Coll. Camb., *Penitent*, R.	
Sanderson, Robt.	Scholar of St. John's Coll. Camb.	
Sandys, Samuel .	V. of Willoughby (F. of Peterhouse, Camb.)	Worcest'r
Saunders, John .	Trin. Coll. Camb. [St. J.]	
Scandrett, John .	V. of Madeley [Madley, R. and L. H.]	Hereford
Schmid (Smith) .	Preacher to Walloon Congregation at Sandwich .	Canterbury
Sclater, William .	V. of Brampton Speke .	Exeter
Scott, — . .	C. of Highgate [W.] .	London
Scrivener, Henry	[Charles, R.], F. of Pemb. Hall, Camb.	

NAME	PREFERMENT, ETC.	DIOCESE
Seaman, Christopher	R. of Winton and Little Snoring	Norwich
Sefton, — . .	[H.]	
Seller, Abednego.	V. of St. Charles, Plym'th	Exeter
Sharp, Isaac .	C. of Stepney (F. of Magd. Coll. Camb.)	London
Shaw, John .	V. of Carleton and Petty Canon of Norwich	Norwich
Sheldon, Ralph .	Steward (Auditor of Accounts) (?) of Ch. Ch. Oxf.	
Sheridan, William	Bp. of Kilmore and Ardagh	
Sherlock, William	Master of the Temple, Lecturer at St. Dunstan's-in-the-West, and V. of Therfield, *Complied*	
Sherwell, John .	Reader at Covent Garden [W.]	London
Shrawly, John .	Chaplain to Lord Lexington [W.]	Hereford
Sims, William (*see* Sym)		
Skelton, Bernard.	R. of Cantley . . .	Norwich
Slater [Slatter, R.]	V. of Chatteris . .	Ely
Sloper, William .	Schoolmaster of Wantage, *Penitent*	Sarum
Smith, Charles .	V. of Sompting and R. of Coombe	Chichest'r
Smith, — . .	V. of Little Packington .	Lichfield
Smith, George .	St. John's Coll. Camb., N.-J. Bishop	
Smith, Henry .	Canon of Ch. Ch. Oxford	
Smith, James .	R. of Lound, *Complied* .	Norwich
Smith [Smyth, K.], Thomas .	F. of Magd. Coll. Oxford, Preb. of Heytesbury	Sarum
Snatt, William .	Preb. of Chichester, and V. of Cuckfield	Chichest'r
Soames, Moses .	R. of Broughton . .	Peterborough
Southcomb, Lewis	R. of Rose Ash, *Penitent* .	Exeter
Southcomb, Lewis, jun.		

NAME	PREFERMENT, ETC.	DIOCESE
Speed, George	Master of the School in St. Mary Axe [W.]	London
Spinckes, Nathaniel	Preb. of Sarum, R. of St. Martin's, Salisbury, N.-J. Bishop.	Sarum
Squib, Laurence	R. of Stanton St. John's	Oxford
Stampe, Thomas	R. of Langley, *Penitent*	Sarum
Standish, Ralph	R. of —	Chester
Sterling, —	Balliol Coll. Oxford [H.]	
Stone, Thomas	R. of Hempstead	Norwich
Strachan, William	[F. of, L. H.] Balliol Coll. Oxford	
Street, —	'C. and Schoolmaster near the Bath'	Bath and Wells
Sutton, Gilbert (?)	Trin. Coll. Cambridge	
Symmes [Simms, L. H.]	R. of Langton	York
Symmes [Sims, R.]	V. of Chislet	Canterbury
Talbot, Andrew	R. of Southstoke	Bath and Wells
Talbot, John	R. of Fretherne (F. of Peterhouse, Camb.), N.-J. Bishop, *Complied*	Gloucest'r
Taylor, Ralph	R. of Severn-Stoke, N.-J. Bishop	Worcest'r
Thomas, Samuel	Preb. of Wells and V. of Chard	Bath and Wells
Thomas, William	Bishop of Worcester	
Thomas, —	Canon of Exeter, *Non-Abjuror*	Exeter
Thomkinson, Thomas	F. of St. John's, Camb., V. of Holy Trinity, Camb.	Ely
Thornly, Edmund	C. of Bury [Littleboro', L. H.]	Chester
Thornton, William	Principal of Hart Hall, Oxford, *Non-Abjuror*	
Thurkettle, Saml.	R. of Littleton.	London
Tisdale, Richard	R. of Felthorpe and Trostrey, and Chaplain to Bishop of Norwich	Norwich

NAME	PREFERMENT, ETC.	DIOCESE
Traffles, Richard, D.C.L.	New College, Oxford [Ant. Wood]	
Trumbull, Charles	R. of Stisted in Essex, Hadleigh in Suffolk, and Chaplain to Archbishop Sancroft	Norwich
Tudway, — .	Mus.B., and Organist of King's Coll. Camb., *Complied*	
Turner, Francis .	Bishop of Ely	
Turner, Thomas .	Archd. of Essex, and Preb.	London
Tutt, Robert .	Sub-Dean of Salisbury .	Sarum
Urry, John .	Student of Ch. Ch. Oxf.	
Vanogden . .	(*See* 'Onley, Humphry')	
Verdon, Thomas .	R. of Great Snoring . F. of St. John's, Camb.	Norwich
Vincent, — .	Curate of — [W.] .	Lincoln
Vincent, — .	C. of Sulhampstead. [W.]	Sarum
Wace, Francis .	R. of Blakeney . .	Norwich
Wagstaffe, John .	R. of Little Wenlock .	Hereford
Wagstaffe, Thos.	Chancellor of Lichfield .	Lichfield
	R. of St. Margaret Pattens, London, N.-J. Bishop	London
Wagstaffe, Thos. (son of the above)	Keeper of Nonjurors' Church Registers	
Walker, Lucius .	R. of Stokesley [W.] .	York
Wall, Henry .	Chpln. to Countess of Kent	
Wase, Christopher	Esquire Bedell at Oxford	
Watson, George .	R. of Millbrook, Bucks .	Lincoln
Watson, John .	R. of Saltfleetby St. Clement's	Lincoln
Webster, Richard	R. of Glemsford, *Complied*	Norwich
Welton, Richard .	R. of Whitechapel, N.-J. Bishop	London
West, Thomas .	R. of Childrey [Childrew, R. and L. H.]	Chester? [R. & W. & L. H.] Oxford

NAME	PREFERMENT, ETC.	DIOCESE
Weybergh, Jeffrey	[C. of, R.] Queen's College, Oxford	
Whatton, William	Chap. to Earl of Rutland	Lincoln
White, Thomas .	Bishop of Peterborough	
Whitehead, — .	St. Mary Hall, Oxford, ord. by Spinckes, 1718	
Whiting, — .	St. John's College, Camb.	
Wigmore, John .	Queens' Coll. Camb., ord. by Gandy, 1727	
Willcox, Giles .	R. of Bixley and C. of Bungay	Norwich
Willet, — .	Of Tattershall [W.] .	Lincoln
Williams, Daniel.	Jesus Coll. Oxford [St. J.]	
Wilson, Edward .	R. of Blatchington .	Chichest'r
Wilson, John .	R. at Northampton? [W.]	Peterborough
Wilson, Robert .	Vicar-Choral, York, C. of Drypool, &c.	York
Wilson, Thomas .	R. of Arrow . . .	Worcest'r
Wilson, Thomas (son of the above)		
Winchilsea, Heneage Finch, 4th Earl of		
Winford, Edward	R. of Harpsden . .	Oxford
Wingfield, —	Of Canterbury, refused to take M.A. degree	Canterbury
Winship[p], Geo.	Preb. of York and R. of Malton	York
Wolley, Charles [Wooley, Samuel, R.]	R. of North Somercoates, *Complied*	Lincoln
Wood, Henry .	Chaplain to Mr. Cholmondeley of Holford	Chester
Wood, John .	Chaplain at Ch. Ch. (?), London	London
Woodroffe, Gabriel	V. of Felsted . . .	London
Woodward, John	F. of Peterhouse, Camb. [*Complied*, St. J.]	
Wooton, Henry .	St. John's Coll. Camb. [St. J.]	

NAME	PREFERMENT, ETC.	DIOCESE
Worsley, Edward	R. of Gatcombe, Isle of Wight	Winchester
Worthington, John	V. of Offenham, Schoolmaster of Evesham (F. of Peterhouse, Camb.)	Worcest'r
Worthington, Thomas	Magd. Hall [Ch. Ch., K.], Oxford, *Non-Abjuror*	
Wortley, Bartholomew	F. of Caius Coll. Camb.	
Wright, Matthew	C. of Warmingham . .	Chester
Wright, Thomas .	V. of Wymondham (F. of St. John's, Camb.)	Norwich
Wynne, Hugh .	F. of All Souls', Oxford, Chancellor of Diocese of St. Asaph . . .	St. Asaph
Yapp, Abraham .	Precentor of Durham and C. of Wilton Gilbert	Durham
Yarborough, Sir Thomas	Of Snaith Hall, Yorks	
Yates or Yeates, John	C. of Lymm . . .	Chester
Yorke, John .	Vicar-Choral of York and R. of St. Peter, of St. Belfry's [St. J.], of St. Michael-le-Belfry	York
Zinzano, Nicholas	R. of St. Martin Outwich	London

SCOTLAND.

The Scotch Nonjurors include the great majority of the Scotch Episcopal Church. It seems to me that all or none should be given, and, as it is quite impossible to give all, I have given none in the above list. The names of the chief leaders will be found in Chapter X.

INDEX

Abjuration Oath, 2, 10, 64, 139, 192, 258, 315, 348
'Account of Church Government,' Brett's, 402
Act of Settlement, 2, 10
'Address to Persons of State and Quality,' Nelson's, 253
Allhallows Barking Church, 93
Altar-piece in Whitechapel Church, 347
America and Nonjuring Bishops, 349, 369–371
Anne, Queen, 11, 65, 73, 202, 218, 239, 427
Anointing the Sick, 354, 357, 358–9
Apographum consecrationis, T. Wagstaffe, 116 *n.*
J. Collier, 119
H. Doughty, 313
Apostolical Constitutions, The, 296, 358–9
Arsenius, Metropolitan of Thebais, 452–3, 457
Ashton, John, 71
Atterbury, Francis, 336

Bailey, Thomas, 147, 181
Baker, Thomas, 46, 56, 189, 226, 281, 409, 416
Balliol College, Oxford, 183, 342
Bedford, Hilkiah, 17, 111–2, 176, 198–203, 217, 274, 311, 320, 321, 324
Bedford, Thomas, 290, 320, 324, 339–340, 409
Bettenham, James, 263
Beveridge, William, 5, 28, 168
Billers, John, 195–7
Bingham, Joseph, 352–3
Bisbie, Nathanael, 40, 224–6
Bishops, Imprisonment of the seven, 23, 24, 25, 26, 31, 40, 48, 58, 61, 71, 75
Bishops, Consecration of, by Nonjurors (in 1693–4), 29–31, 84–91
(in 1713), 118 *et seq.*
(in 1715–6), 137 *et seq.*
(in 1720–1), 311
(later), 312–25
Nonjuring, in Scotland, 420
at large in Scotland, 436 *et seq.*, 445
Blackbourne, John, 283, 306, 308, 314–6
Bonwicke, Ambrose, the elder, 255–6, 262
Bonwicke, Ambrose, the younger, 197, 219, 256–8
Life of, 410
Boothe, Charles, 373
Bowdler family, 325, 327
Bowdler, John, 18
Bowdler, Thomas, 254
Bowyer, William, the elder, 221, 261–2, 266, 315, 406
Bowyer, William, the younger, 257, 262–3, 334
Brett family, 325
Brett, Thomas, the elder, 20, 138–147, 151, 211, 288, 297, 353, 356, 395, 401
on the Usages, 302–5
and the Eastern Church, 453–4
Brett, Thomas, the younger, 307, 317
Brokesby, Francis, 206–7, 232, 382
'Life of Dodwell,' by, 237–8, 410
'History of Government of Primitive Church,' by, 409
Browne, P. J., 363–4
Browne, Thomas, 198
Bull, George, 245
'Life of,' by Nelson, 410

Burnet, Gilbert, 5, 16, 34, 66, 106 *et seq.*, 160–1, 195, 347, 422
Byrom, John, 332, 342–4, 359, 363–4
'Remains,' 410

Cambridge Nonjurors, 186 *et seq.*
Campbell, Archibald, 118–9, 312, 351, 421, 440–1, 445–6
'Middle State,' 402–4
Carte, Samuel, 127, 283
Carte, Thomas, 127, 335
'History of England,' by, 408–9
Cartwright, Thomas, 24
Cartwright, William, 290, 364 *et seq.*
'Case in View,' Dodwell's, 46, 120, 150–1, 235
'Case in View, now in Fact,' Dodwell's, 120, 149, 150, 235
'Case of Allegiance,' Sherlock's, 5, 115
'Case of Reason,' &c., Law's, 398
'Case of Resistance,' Sherlock's, 5
'Case of Schism in Church of England Fairly Stated,' L. Howell's, 214–5
'Case of the Regale and Pontificate,' Leslie's, 91
'Cautionary Discourse of Schism,' Dodwell's, 232
Cave, William, 219, 382, 401
'Character of a Jacobite,' 13, 14
Charity Schools, 265–6
Cherry, Francis, 157, 161, 204, 231, 238–240, 241 *et seq*
Chevalier, the old, 11, 12, 121, 161–2, 307–8, 338, 341, 408, 446
Chevalier, the young, 11, 325, 338
Cholmondeley, Francis, 271
Chrism in Confirmation, 354, 357, 366
Cibber, Colley, 12–13, 19 *et seq.*, 282
Clandestine Consecrations, 90
Clarendon, Henry, second Earl of, 36, 85, 157, 221, 271–2, 282
'Diary' of, 49, 160, 221, 272
'Clarendon's History of the Rebellion,' 11
Clayton, John, 290, 333, 343
Cock, John, 220
Cole, William, 220–1
Collier, Jeremy, 9, 19, 21, 119, 121–9, 217, 268, 283, 291 *et seq.*
Autobiography of, 410
'Essays on Moral Subjects,' 414–5
Collier, Jeremy, 'Short View of the English Stage,' 415–6
on the Usages, 295–6, 304–5
and the Eastern Church, 453–4
'Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain,' 407–8
'Desertion Discussed, The,' 123
'Collier's (Mr.) Desertion Discussed,' 293, 315
Communion office of 1718, 293–5, 301
Preface, 302
Tracts for and against, 303
'Companion to the Festivals and Fasts' (Nelson), 154, 206, 253, 382–3
'Compleat Collection of Devotions' (Deacon), 357–9
'Compounders' and 'Non-Compounders,' 216
Compton, Henry, 57, 73, 422–3, 435
'Conference between Junius and Gerontius' (Gandy), 149–51
'Constitution of the Catholic Church' (Hickes), 91, 151, 402
Controversial Works of Nonjurors, 392–400
Leslie, 392–4
Hickes, 394–5
Brett, 395–6
Spinckes, 396
Dodwell and Howell, 397
Law, 397–400
Convention Parliament, 36
Convocation of Oxford University, 4
Cosin, John, 32, 163
Cotton, Sir John, 176
Country Gentlemen, 240, 270
Country Services for Nonjurors, 288–290
Crewe, Nathaniel, 164, 168, 189–190
Crosthwaite, Thomas, 178–9

Deacon, Thomas, 288, 290, 305, 307, 332, 333, 343, 354–63, 365, 373
Declaration of Indulgence, James's, 72, 76, 94, 189–90
'Defence of our Constitution in Church and State' (N. Marshall), 110, 284
'Deprived Fathers, The,' 23–83, 107, 276, 309
'Desertion Discussed, The' (Collier), 123

Digby, Lord, 241
Divine Right, The Doctrine of, 3–6
'Doctrine of Church of Rome concerning Purgatory' (Deacon), 355–6
'Doctrine of the Cross, The,' 6 *n.*, 65
Dodwell, Henry, 9, 63, 140, 149–51, 157, 160, 206, 219, 229–38, 251, 391, 397. (Works under their titles.)
Domestic Chaplains, 123, 131, 133, 170, 312
Doughty, Henry, 313–4
Downes, Theophilus, 183, 202
Drake, Samuel, 337

Earbery, Matthias, 211–3, 283, 306
Eastern Church, Correspondence with, 313, 451–65
Brett's account of, 453–4
Edmund Hall Nonjurors, St., 181
Εἰκὼν βασιλική, Wagstaffe on, 114
Ellis, James, 264–5
Ely House Chapel, 49, 160, 172, 282
Episcopal College (Scotland), 445–6
Erastianism in England, 7, 247
in Scotland, 446
Essentialists (Usagers), 300, 301, 303, 332, 337
Eucharist, Sacrificial character of the, 292, 322, 383
Evelyn, John, 276

Falconer, John, 439–40, 444
Fenton, Elijah, 13, 186, 258–9
Fenwick Plot, The, 54, 59
Filmer, Sir R., 4, 151
Fitzwilliam, John, 55, 63, 169–72
Forbes, Robert, 323–5, 338, 365
Frampton, Robert, 24, 29, 69–74, 233, 281
Life of, 69 *et seq.*
Friend, Sir John, 217
'Full, true, and comprehensive view of Christianity' (Deacon), 361, 368, 369

Gadderar, James, 118–9, 441–3, 445–6
Gandy, Henry, 20, 119, 134, 135, 147–52, 283, 306
Garnett, Thomas, 372–3
George I., 3, 11, 162, 429–31
George II., 336, 343
George III., 368, 450
Gibson, Edmund, 109
Giffard, William, 58, 88
Gloucester, Death of Duke of, 10
Gordon, Robert, 263, 284, 323–8, 338, 370
Gower, Humphry, 188–9
'Grand and Important Question' (on Church Communion), 284–6
Granville, Denis, 5, 163–9, 312
Grascome, Samuel, 207–11, 283
Greek Church, The, 173
Griffin, John, 312–3, 454

Hall, Henry, 316
Harbin, George, 202, 203–5, 273
Harte, Walter, 184–6
Hawes, Samuel, 119, 133–7, 219, 274, 281, 455
Headley in Surrey, 255 *et seq.*
Hearne, Thomas, 90, 111, 114, 147, 148, 150, 177–8, 194, 200, 206, 219, 232, 240, 409, and *passim*
'Autobiography' and 'Collections,' 410, and *passim*
'Itinerary of John Leland,' &c., 416
Hereditary Right, 3 *et seq.*
'Hereditary Right of Crown of England Asserted,' 200–3, 248
Hickes, George, 9, 20, 29, 56, 72, 77, 81, 84 *et seq.*, 91–112, 118–9, 127–9, 130, 137, 140, 143, 153–4, 219, 220, 247, 248, 283, 290–1, 353, 390, 394–5, 400, 401
'Thesaurus,' &c., 414
'Anglo-Saxon and Mœso-Gothic Grammar,' 414. (Other works under their titles.)
Hickes, John, 92, 97–9
Higden, William, 148, 200
Historical and Biographical Works of Nonjurors, 400–1
'History of the Clemency of our English Monarchs' (Earbery), 312–3
Holdsworth, Edward, 341, 342, 416
Hooper, George, 45, 62, 63, 65, 66
Hope, John, 314
Horsley, Samuel, 369
Hough, John, 175, 181
Howell, Laurence, 21, 213–5, 397, 406
Hymns, Ken's, 379

'Immoral Prayers, The,' 209, 237, 247
Indemnity Act of 1718, 431
Independence of Church in Spirituals, 6–7, 141, 151
Invocation, Prayer of, 295, 322
Ipswich, Suffragan Bishop of, 29, 91
Irregular Offshoots of Nonjurors, 328–9
The first, 346–51
The second, 351–75

'Jacobite Conventicle, A,' 286–7
'Jacobite Liturgy, The,' 41, 49
Jacobite Songs and Ballads, 413
Jacobites, The, 10, 14, 41, 59, 64, 66, 158, 180–2, 222, 246, 359
Jacomb, Thomas, 265
James II., 2, 10, 47–8, 51, 54, 61, 86–7, 90, 94, 166–7, 174–5, 254–5
Jebb, Sir Richard, 268
Jebb, Samuel, 268, 455
Jenkin, Robert, 80, 81, 192–3, 273
Jennens, Charles, 341–2
Johnson, John, of Cranbrook, 145–6, 383, 401
'Life of,' by Brett, 410–1
Johnson, Samuel, 12 *et seq.*, 122, 156, 182, 258, 441
'Jure Divino' (Gandy), 151

Ken, Thomas, 24, 28, 29, 40 *et seq.*, 44–5, 46, 55, 60–9, 82, 98, 155, 170, 176–7, 204, 233, 239, 273–4, 378–80. (Works under their titles.)
Kennett, White, 5, 43, 95–7, 109, 191, 242, 347
Kenyon, Roger, 266–7
Kettlewell, John, 14, 58, 65, 131, 153–6, 170, 209, 234–5, 247, 263, 380–1. (Works under their titles.)
Kidder, Richard, 204
King, William, 182

Lake, John, 14, 25, 41, 78–82
Lambeth Chapel, 280–2
Laud, William, 32
Laurence, Roger, 283, 351–4
Law, William, 281, 330–3, 334, 335, 342, 385–90, 397, 400, 465–6. (Works under their titles.)
Lawyers, Nonjuring, 268–70
'Lay Baptism Invalid' (R. Laurence), 352
'Layman's Apology, A' (Podmore), 374–5
Lee, Francis, 250–4, 266, 283, 391
'Life of Kettlewell,' 69, 410 and *passim*
Lee, Thomas, 265
Lee, William, 283
Leslie, Charles, 156–62, 221, 239, 261, 266, 281, 297–300, 307, 392–4. (Works under their titles.)
'Letter out of Suffolk' (Wagstaffe), 117
Lindsay, John, 222, 333–5
Liturgical Studies of Nonjurors, 142–3, 144, 357
Liturgies used by the Primitive Church, A Collection of (Brett), 402
Lloyd, William (of Norwich), 24, 29, 38–46, 66, 81, 88, 263
Lloyd, William (of St. Asaph), 25, 48, 73, 231, 282, 422
London as a Nonjuring Centre, 282–8
Lowndes, Ralph, 270–1
'Lyon in Mourning, The,' 323

Magdalen College, Oxford, 71, 173–5
Manchester and Jacobitism, 280, 343–4, 360–2
'Manual for Winchester Scholars' (Ken), 378–9
Marshall, Nathanael, 110–1, 284
Mary II., 3
Mary of Modena, 162, 167
Mawman, Timothy, 306, 323
'Measures of Christian Obedience' (Kettlewell), 154
'Middle State' (Campbell), 402–4
Milbourne, Luke, 39
Mill, John, 181
Millington, James, 270, 373, 374
Mixed Chalice, The, 292, 297, 306, 337, 444
Moor, Jonathan, 265
Morley, George, 170

Nelson, Robert, 90, 110, 130, 131, 154, 202–3, 235, 239, 244–50, 252, 261, 274, 276, 381–4. (Works under their titles.)
Newmarsh, Timothy, 350–1
Nicolson, William, 109, 282, 435–6
'No Reason for Restoring the Prayers, &c.' (Spinckes)

Nobleman, Nonjuring, 271 *et seq.*
Non-Abjurors, 3
Non-Usagers, 306

Oath of Allegiance, 2, 3, 26–7, 34, 77, 80, 81, and *passim*
Abjuration, 2, 3, and *passim*
Oblatory Prayer (Holy Communion), 292, 295
Oratories, Nonjurors', 281–4, 356, 366
Orme, Robert, 221–2
'Orthodox British Church,' 370, 374
'Overall's Convocation Book,' 36, 115, 117
Oxford Movement, The, 18
Oxford, on Non-resistance, 4
Attractions of, to Nonjurors, 179–80, 231
Authorities favourable to Nonjurors, 180–3
Stronghold of Jacobitism, 180–3, 186

Paman, J. H., 267
Panting, Matthew, 182
Parker, Samuel, the elder, 174, 260
Parker, Samuel, the younger, 259–60
Parkyns, Sir William, 124–6, 217
Passive Obedience, 3, 6, 81, and *passim*
'Passive Obedience, History of' (Collier), 208
Patrick, Simon, 5
Patristic Studies, 400 *et seq.*
'Pattern for Young Students' (A. Bonwicke), 257, 263
Penitent, Forms of Admission of a, 287–8, 357
Pepys, Samuel, 130, 275–6
'Persuasive to Royalists' (Collier), 281
Physicians, Nonjuring, 113, 218, 250, 266–8, 356, 362, 363
Pinchbeck, Martin, 215–6
Podmore, Thomas, 373–5
Poetical Works of Nonjurors, 411–3
Ken's, 411–2
Fenton's, 412
Byrom's, 412–3
Harte's, 413
'Practical Treatise on Christian Perfection' (Law), 385–6
Practical and Devotional Works, 378–91
Ken's, 378–80
Kettlewell's, 380–1
Nelson's, 381–4
Spinckes', 384–5
Law's, 385–90
Seller's, 390
edited by Nonjurors, 390–1
Prayer-Book of 1549, 291–2, 293, 296
of 1718 (Nonjurors'), 293–5, 301
of 1734 (Deacon's), 257–9, 359
of 1761 (Cartwright's), 372
Prayer for the Faithful Departed, 292
for the Descent of the Spirit upon the Elements, 292
'Preservative against the Nonjurors' (Hoadly), 110
Preston Plot, The, 50, 52, 53
Price, Kenrick, 363–5, 370
Printers, Nonjuring, 261–3
Protestantism of Nonjurors, 93–4, 129, 145 and *passim*
Pryme, Abraham de la, 289
Public Worship, 8, 280–1, 331
Purgatory, 355–6

Rattray, Thomas, 443, 447, 302
Rawlinson, Richard, 194, 269, 283, 318–20
Thomas, 318, 344–5
'Reasons for Restoring some Prayers,' &c. (Collier), 295–6
Rebellion of 1715, 11, 19, 336, 430–1
of 1745, 360, 373, 448–9
'Records of the New Consecrations,' 84–91
'Reflections on Learning' (Baker), 416
'Regale and Pontificate' (Leslie), 126, 157
Regency Scheme, 27, 34
Relief of the Distressed Clergy, Scheme for, 131, 155, 263–4
Revolution, The English, 10, 26, and *passim*
Rome, Church of, 12, 145, 451, and *passim*
Roper, Francis, 197
Rose, Alexander, 420–6, 432–7
Ross, Arthur, 419, 433
Royal Supremacy, The, 89 and *passim*

Russell, Lord William, 5, 154, 171
Lady Rachel, 171, 172
Russia, Holy Governing Synod of, 464

Sage, John, 437–9
St. John's College, Cambridge, *Socii ejecti*, 187 *et seq.*
Baker's 'History of,' 416, and *passim*
Salmon, Nathanael, 218
Sancroft, William, 24, 29, 31–8, 40–1, 46, 62–3, 88, 113, 117, 164, 223, 267, 280, 282, 421
Sanderson, Robert, 4
Schism, Nonjurors on, 7–8
Schoolmasters, Nonjuring, 255–6, 258–9, 264–6
'Sclater's Original Draught of the Primitive Church,' 404–6
Scotch Nonjurors, 118–9, 418–50
Bishops, 312, 313–4, 326, 420–5, 434, 435, 445–8
Service-Book of 1637, 444
Scott, John, 28, 108
Seabury, Samuel, 369–71
Seller, Abednego, 219–20, 390
'Serious Call, A' (Law), 386–9
Services in Nonjuring Oratories in London, 286–8, 324–5
outside London, 288–90, 340
Sharp, John, 16–7, 20, 248, 264, 435
Sheridan, William, 60
Sherlock, Thomas, 17, 448–9
Sherlock, William, 5, 17, 37, 60, 115, 207, 233
Shottesbrooke (in Berkshire), 157, 161, 206, 229 *et seq.*
'Sick Man Visited, The' (Spinckes), 384
Skinner, John, 424–5, 442
Smith, George, 320–3, 324, 409, 447–8
Smith, Thomas, 45, 172–8, 410
Snatt, William, 124, 216–8, 306
Soame, Moses, 288–9
Soldiers, Nonjuring, 263–4
Somers, Lord, 96
Sophia, The Electress, 10
South, Robert, 28
Speed, George, 265
Spinckes, Nathanael, 9, 119, 129–33, 276, 307, 384–5, 391, 396
on the Usages, 296, 303
and the Eastern Church, 453–4
'State Prayer Days,' 237
Stillingfleet, Edward, 5, 207
Stuarts, The, 9–10, 46, 179, 418, and *passim*
Suffragan Bishops (under Henry VIII.'s Act), 29, 89, 90–1, 191–2, 316
'Synopsis Canonum' (L. Howell), 406

Talbot, John, 348–50
Talbot, William, 94, 95
Taylor, Ralph, 203, 311–2, 346
Tenison, Thomas, 73, 139, 141
'Terræ Filius' (N. Amherst), 180
'Thesaurus,' &c. (Hickes), 109, 130
Thetford, Suffragan Bishop of, 29, 91, 119
Thomas, William, 24, 25, 74–8
'Three Letters to the Bishop of Bangor' (Law), 397–8
Tillotson, John, 5, 28, 106 *et seq.*, 233, 247
Toleration Act (Scotland), of 1712, 428–9, 430
'Tradition Necessary,' &c. (Brett), 297
Trelawney, Sir J., 25
Trumbull, Charles, 223
Turner, Francis, 24, 29, 34, 46–56, 62, 80, 81, 113, 171, 177, 181, 203, 282
Turner, Thomas, 54, 60, 62, 63, 181, 242

'Unity of the Christian Priesthood' (Bisbie), 225, 234
'Unreasonableness of a New Separation' (Stillingfleet), 198, 208
Usages Controversy, The, 290–308
The Four Points, 291
Rise of, 292–5
Tracts on, 295–301
Usagers victors in, 306–8
Efforts to end, 321–2
in Scotland, 440, 443–5

'View of the English Constitution' (Higden), 148, 200
'View of the Pontificate,' &c. (L. Howell), 397
'Vindication of the Deprived Bishops' (Dodwell), 150, 234

Wagstaffe, Thomas, the elder, 29, 112–8, 206–7

Wagstaffe, Thomas, the younger, 305, 307, 325, 336–9
Wake, William, 191, 435, 464–5
Warburton, William, 195
Warming-pan Story, 10
Waterland, Daniel, 322, 401
Watson, John, 226
Welton, Richard, 283, 287, 346–9
Weymouth, Viscount, 202, 204, 272–4
Wharton, Henry, 32, 108, 165
Wheatley, Charles, 353
Wheler, Sir George, 109
Whiston, William, 195, 258–9
William III., 2, 3, 10, 27, 239, 422–4
Winchilsea, Heneage, second Earl of, 199
Winchilsea, Heneage, fourth Earl of, 119, 133, 135, 274–5
Wood, Anthony, 50, 147, 169
Wordsworth, Christopher, 91
Wynne, Hugh, 268–9

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO. LTD., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON

DATE DUE

'61

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

76845 283.1s B826

AUTHOR
Broxap, Henry

TITLE
The later Non-Jurors

283.1Q
Ov 2

34327